7 C 3
Scarce book
add

LIBRARY
OF THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
AT
PRINCETON, N. J.

DONATION OF
SAMUEL AGNEW,
OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Letter.....
No.....
March 15th 1855.
Rare

Case, Division.....
Shelf, Section.....
Book,

SCC
1342

Univerſaliſm confounds and deſtroys itſelf;

OR,

LETTERS TO A FRIEND;

IN FOUR PARTS.

PART I.

Dr. Huntington's and Mr. Relly's Scheme, which denies all future puniſhment, ſhown to be made up of contradictions.

PART II.

Dr. Chauncy's, Mr. Winchester's, Petitpierre's, and Med Dr. Young's Scheme, which ſuppoſes a limited puniſhment hereafter, ſhown to be made up of contradictions.

PART III.

Everlaſting, forever, forever and ever, naturally and originally, mean duration without end.

PART IV.

The ſufficiency of the *Atonement*, for the ſalvation of *all*, conſiſtent with the final deſtruction of a part of mankind. Alſo the *Second Death* explained.

Interſperſed with direct arguments in proof of the endleſs miſery of the damned. And anſwers to the popular objections, of the preſent day, againſt the Doctrines of Grace.

By JOSIAH SPAULDING, A. M.
Paſtor of a Church in *Buckland*.

PRINTED AT *NORTHAMPTON*, MASSACHUSETTS.

By ANDREW WRIGHT.—*For the* AUTHOR.

1805.

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS, to wit:

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on the twenty-third day of July, in the thirtieth Year of the Independence of the UNITED STATES of AMERICA, JOSIAH SPAULDING, of the said District, hath deposited in this Office the Title of a Book, the Right whereof he claims as Author, in the words following, *to wit*: "Universalism confounds and destroys itself: or, Letters to a "Friend. In Four Parts. Part I. Dr. Huntington's and Mr. "Relly's Scheme, which denies all future punishment, shown to "be made up of contradictions. Part II. Dr. Chauncy's, Mr. "Winchester's, Petitpierre's and Med. Dr. Young's Scheme, "which supposes a limited punishment hereafter, shown to be "made up of contradictions. Part III. Everlasting, forever, "forever and ever, naturally and originally mean duration "without end. Part IV. The sufficiency of the atonement, "for the salvation of *all*, consistent with the final destruction of "*a part* of mankind. Also, the Second Death explained. In-"terspersed with direct arguments in proof of the endless misе-"ry of the damned. And answers to the popular objections of "the present day, against the doctrines of grace. By Josiah "Spaulding, A. M. Pastor of a Church in *Buckland*." In conformity to the Act of the Congress of the United States, intitled, "An Act for the encouragement of Learning, by secur-"ing the Copies of Maps, *Charts* and Books, to the Authors "and Proprietors of such Copies, during the Times therein "mentioned;" and also to an Act intitled, "An Act supple-"mentary to an Act, intitled, an Act for the Encouragement of "Learning, by securing the Copies of Maps, Charts, and "Books, to the Authors and Proprietors of such Copies during "the Times therein mentioned; and extending the Benefits "thereof to the Arts of Designing, Engraving and Etching "Historical, and other Prints."

N. GOODALE, { *Clerk of the District of Massachusetts.*

CONTENTS.

PART I.

Dr Huntington's and Mr. Relly's Scheme, which denies all future punishment, shown to be made up of contradictions.

LETTER I.

What led Dr. Huntington into his Scheme, also his foundation of faith, compared to what he says on the doctrine of election *and other things in his Book.* . . . . page 9

LETTER II.

Dr. H's foundation of faith further examined, compared, &c. 21

LETTER III.

Dr. H, holds that all who are impenitent at death are then regenerated; this compared to his rule of faith, and to other things in his Scheme; also the absurd consequences of this sentiment. 38

LETTER IV.

Dr. H's definition of the Gospel compared to what he says befel Judas. 58

LETTER V.

Dr. H's definition of the gospel compared to what he says of the apostate Jews, and of the Limitarians his opponents. 73

LETTER VI.

Dr. H's opinion that the Law and the Gospel are in direct opposition to each other, examined, and compared to other things in his Book; also the absurd and most shocking consequences of this opinion. 85

LETTER VII.

Dr. H's opinion of law and gospel, continued. 96

LETTER VIII.

Dr. H's sentiment that believers have only negative virtue, *compared to the character he takes to himself.* . . . 107

LETTER IX.

Mr. Relly's Scheme of Union, examined. 115

PART II.

Dr. Chauncy's, Mr. Winchester's, Mr. Petitpierre's, and Med. Dr. Young's Scheme, which supposes a limited punishment hereafter, shown to be made up of contradictions.

LETTER I.

Mr. Winchester, following Dr. Chauncy, holds that all men are saved by Grace, and, in contradiction to this, that the damned suffer all they deserve. 123

LETTER II.

Briefly stating the contradictory arguments, used by Dr. Chauncy, and the other writers in this scheme. . . . 141

PART III.

The natural & proper meaning of everlasting, eternal, forever, forever & ever, & the original words from which these are translated, shown to be endless duration. Also, objections considered.

LETTER I.

Shewing the common use of these words, and their necessary use and import in Scripture. 161

LETTER II.

The Greek and Hebrew words, from which eternity, *and its* derivatives *are translated, examined; the instances of their use in scripture, enumerated; and remarks upon some of the instances that are the most important and decided.* . . 179

LETTER III.

Objections to the foregoing, considered. 207

PART IV.

The sufficiency of the *Atonement*, for the salvation of *all*, consistent with the final destruction of *a part* of mankind. Also *the Second Death* explained.

LETTER I.

The atonement makes provision for all men to be reconciled to God, and reconciliation to him explained. . . . 234

LETTER II.

Full atonement for all, *consistent with the final perdition of* part *of mankind, illustrated and proved from facts.* . 267

LETTER III.

Whether sin deserves endless punishment; which is further to illustrate the consistency of this punishment with full atonement. 303

LETTER IV.

Containing an explanation of the Second Death. . . 335

Univerſaliſm conſounds and deſtroys itſelf, &c.

PART I.

Dr. Huntington's and Mr. Relly's Scheme, which denies all future puniſhment, ſhown to be made up of contradictions.

LETTER I.

What led Dr. Huntington into his Scheme, alſo his foundation of faith, compared to what he ſays on the doctrine of election *and other things in his Book.*

My dear Friend,

THE plan propoſed was thought to be good. Inability to execute it, you recollect, was the objection. Which nothing could have removed but your candour, ſacredly pledged.

Doctor Huntington profeſſes to have written his *treatiſe*, for the great end of *improving calviniſm*, and uniting all religious parties. He tells us, 'The arminian ſcheme is full of inconſiſtencies.' 'The calviniſtic ſcheme, in the *limitarian* ſenſe,'* he adds, 'is every whit as *full of contradiction* and abſurdity. 'The ſame may be ſaid of all the reſt that ever have been advanced in the world, except this alone. But this has not the 'ſhadow of inconſiſtency with itſelf.'† His ſcheme, therefore, being ſo conſiſtent with itſelf, while all others are *full* of abſurdity, is the only one which will bear examination. And his doctrines, we might expect, are thoſe only which will exhibit a train of conſiſtency, when compared together.

In the early part of his life, Dr. H. felt himſelf much embarraſſed with the doctrine of particular election and reprobation, as underſtood in the calviniſtic or limitarian ſenſe. How to reconcile this with free grace, was to him a great queſtion. While

* That which ſuppoſes ſome part of mankind will be finally loſt. And, thoſe who hold with Calvin, as to the final ſtate of the righteous and the wicked in the next world, our author calls *limitarians*.

† Page 182.

While he was attempting to extricate himſelf from this ſuppoſed difficulty, he was gradually led into his plan of univerſal ſalvation. As he here informs us. 'What has lain on his mind* 'with increaſing preſſure is this. When he had exhibited to 'his audience the infinite fulneſs and all-ſufficiency of Chriſt 'to ſave ſinners, both by price and by power; and the great 'duty of every ſinner to believe it to the ſalvation of his ſoul, 'then to tell them; 'Many ſinners, many alas! are left out of "the covenant of redemption; many for whom Chriſt never "died. A part only are comprehended, a very few in compar- "iſon,'——'God will certainly make ſuch as are elected, to "believe, by his own almighty power and grace; and he will "moſt certainly leave all the reſt to eternal damnation, as their "ſins juſtly deſerve: for they never were comprehended in the "decree of God, or the covenant of redemption and ſalvation.' 'I have been more and more preſſed and perplexed in my own 'mind with regard to the conſiſtency of this manner of preach- 'ing with itſelf, or with the word of God.'† In this line of ſtating, or rather miſſtating of things, he ought to have 'been 'more and more perplexed in his own mind.' For he intimates a deficiency in the *atonement*, as the cauſe why ſo many ſuffer eternal miſery: eſtimating the righteouſneſs of Chriſt in proportion to the number ſaved. And that ſinners, contrary to their own choice, are excluded, by the divine decrees, from believing in Jeſus. Whereas they ought to be reminded of the Saviour's words to the Jews. 'O Jeruſalem, Jeruſalem!— 'how often would I have gathered thy children together,—and 'ye would not.'

The Doctor goes on to ſay, 'My audience have generally al- 'moſt to a man ſet down ſatisfied. Yet, at evening, much per- 'plexity hath invaded my own mind; thoughts have thus re- 'turned upon me. I have this day told my audience, making 'no difference, and without the exception of a ſingle perſon, 'that if we do not believe that God hath given to us eternal 'life in his Son, we make him a liar; and quoted the evangeliſt 'John in ſupport of it.'—'I have told them they muſt ſo be- 'lieve; they have right to, they ought to do it; and then every 'one of them ſhall be ſaved. When upon the *limitarian* plan, 'I know not that one tenth part of them, or even one of them 'was ever included in the covenant of redemption, or given to 'Chriſt, or that he ever died for one ſoul of them. Ought I not 'to have known for whom among them Chriſt did indeed die, 'before

* Meaning his own mind; he ſometimes ſpeaks of himſelf in the third perſon.
† Page 7, 8.

'before I gave out this doctrine; and then to have addressed the 'same to them only? or ought I not, at least, to have spoken 'hypothetically and said; *if you are of the number of the elect*, 'you have full warrant and ground to believe to salvation. 'Otherwise there is no foundation laid for your faith; but, on 'the contrary, you will make God a liar in so believing, as you 'will believe what he knows is not true, viz. that every soul 'that hears the gospel has a foundation for his saving faith, laid 'in Christ.'* We again see how Dr. H. has mistaken the nature and extent of the *atonement*, as well as the calvinistic principles relative to it. This will hereafter be considered.

As the above leads us to expect, Dr. H. supposes the gospel cannot be preached with propriety, if only a part of the human race is saved. 'The more I have thought on these things,' he says, 'the more I am convinced of the utter inconsistency of the 'general preaching of protestant divines, on any other ground 'than this—All mankind are alike included in the most glorious and merciful covenant of redemption.'† It is a fixed principle with the Doctor, that if part of mankind be chosen to eternal life, and the remainder marked out for eternal death, it is then nothing but contradiction and absurdity to make offers of free grace to every creature. A consistent scheme of free grace, as he pretends, and the offer of free grace to all men, must presuppose the salvation of all men.

But the Doctor holds to predestination, election and reprobation, in his sense of them, as strongly as can be expressed by words. He considers 'the fore-knowledge of God to be founded in his own infinitely wise choice, and unalterable determination or decree:'—'including every thought, volition or inclination of all moral agents, that should ever come into being.'‡ 'And every thing moral and natural,' says he, 'every being and 'mode of being, every circumstance, and connection and consequence throughout the whole system of being, did originally, 'absolutely depend on the choice, election, decree, or predestination of the eternal, immutable Jehovah. And all things, in 'actual being, have now the same entire, absolute dependance, 'and ever will have to all eternity. I can conceive of no God 'at all but in the above view. If I recede in the least, from this 'idea, I fall into complete atheism.'§

Under the head of particular election and reprobation, he remarks upon the great distinction God makes between one man and another, and between bodies of men. As in these words:

'Election,

* P. 3, 10. † P. 14. ‡ P. 72. § P. 73.

'Election, or predeſtination hath ſometimes ſpecial regard to 'ſome particular men, in diſtinction from others; and is always 'ſovereign, and becoming God, who never can foreſee any diſ-'tinctions among creatures, but what, from all eternity, he was 'determined himſelf to make. Thus, he elected Abraham to be 'a favorite of his, the father of his covenant people, rather than 'Nahor. Thus, for wiſe and holy ends, he choſe that Pharaoh 'ſhould be an example of great obſtinancy, rather than Moſes. 'Thus, he elected Jacob, rather than Eſau; David, rather than 'Shimei;—Paul to know and enjoy the conſolations of the goſ-'pel, rather than Pilate.—Thus the Jews were elected to enjoy 'the ſpecial privileges of divine revelation, for a long ſeaſon, 'in diſtinction from all their fellow men beſide. Alſo, a few 'among them were elected to know and enjoy inward ſaving 'conſolation, in this world, in diſtinction from the great major-'ity of that nation.'* Thus far his account of thoſe who had 'the oracles of God, before Chriſt's time.

And the whole body of chriſtians, from Chriſt's time to the preſent, or the gentiles who have had the goſpel, he has given a character not preferable, certainly, to that he has given the Jews. See in Let. V. Part I. Therefore, but few among *them*, as he argues, have been 'elected to know and enjoy inward ſaving 'conſolation, in this world, in diſtinction from the great ma-'jority.'

Of the pagan world in general Dr. H. gives us this account. 'Satan hath long led away moſt of the nations after images, and 'into various kinds of idolatry.'† In connection with this, Satan and the Mediator he repreſents 'as two oppoſite parties, car-'rying on a long war, or a long obſtinate battle.'‡ 'The point 'Satan aimed at,' he adds, 'was to involve us all in death, tem-'poral, ſpiritual, and eternal.'' 'Satan ſhall not finally have 'his will in the leaſt part, or degree; though for a ſeaſon he may 'be gratified.'§ Although Satan, as the Doctor here aſſerts, will be completely defeated in the final iſſue; yet for a long ſeaſon he will be gratified, by involving men in death, temporal, and ſpiritual. And this is what we underſtand by the above expreſſion. 'Satan hath long led away moſt of the nations after images,' &c. Again, keeping up the connection, our author ſays, 'For divine wiſdom and goodneſs have ordained, that there 'ſhall be a long contention, and the war not ſoon over.' 'The 'prize in conteſt may be divided for a time; and Satan may 'ſeem to have the greateſt ſhare of it. It has indeed been ſo ever

* P. 75, 76. † P. 216. ‡ P. 208. § P. 209, 214.

'ever ſince the fall, to this day, and may be ſo, to the end of 'this preſent world.'* Thus, according to Dr. H, Satan is likely to ſhare the greateſt part of the prize, and to lead away moſt of the nations after images, as he has already done; holding them under the power of ſpiritual death, to the end of this preſent world.

Furthermore, under the head of election Dr. H. ſays, 'Not 'only all particular perſons that are wiſe and virtuous, holy and 'good, in this life; but alſo all churches or holy communities, 'that, as ſuch, ſuſtain the character now mentioned, enjoy alſo 'all the privileges and comforts connected with ſuch a charac-'ter, *in this life*, in conſequence of the eternal election, or free 'ſovereign choice of God. And they are, in this proper and 'very important ſenſe, *the elect*; in contradiſtinction from 'thoſe that live in blindneſs, and are tormented by the cruel 'power of unſanctified nature, and diſtreſſed with the awful 'ſlavery of ſin.'†

In this manner we have the Doctor's account of the ſtate of mankind, from the beginning to the end of time. The great body of the nations led away wholly by Satan, or held in pagan darkneſs. Where revelation is, but few who are, in this important ſenſe, *the elect*, in contradiſtinction from the 'great 'majority' that are tormented by the cruel power 'of unſanctified nature.

We may now, my dear Friend, ſee how Dr. H. labours to eſtabliſh the ſame things, in kind, which he charges upon his opponents. Which things are very exceptionable in his view. As,

1. That only a very ſmall part of mankind is *elected*, as to this life; and that the 'great majority' is reprobated, or given up to the dominion of ſin, until the day of their death. At death, he pretends, all men are made holy. See in Let. III. Part. I.

2. That the depravity of man is total. This is implied in the words, 'Diſtreſſed with the awful ſlavery of ſin.' And he aſſerts this doctrine in emphatical terms, and dwells upon it, and ſays, 'Fallen man [or men] became as bad in a moral view, 'as fallen angels, at their firſt apoſtacy, according to their infe-'rior natural capacity.'‡

3. He holds to the ſame way as to the application of divine grace, or the power of divine grace, on the hearts of men, and their recovery from ſin, as the limitarians do. Which is wholly by the creative and ſanctifying agency of the Spirit, and application of the word. This is clearly implied in what he ſays on the

* P. 214. † P. 77. ‡ P. 141.

the divine decrees and election, as we have ſeen. And 'we 'differ not a ſingle attom,' ſays he, 'as to the way and manner 'of application [of divine grace to men]; but only in this, I 'extend the glorious work of God, and every good influence of 'it, much further than they do,'* meaning his opponents.

4. Dr. H, holds to man's activity and free agency; and that every one is under ſacred obligation to believe and obey the goſpel immediately, or as ſoon as he hears it. His idea of this we ſhall preſently ſee.

5. We have had Dr. H's ſenſe of the divine decrees, and of our entire dependance on God: 'All things, in actual being, 'have now the ſame entire, abſolute dependance, and ever will 'have to all eternity.'

His ſore complaint againſt the limitarians, as cited above, may now be turned againſt himſelf. This complaint the Doctor keeps up, throughout his book. That, in their plan, 'Many ſinners, 'many alas! are left out of the covenant of redemption; many 'for whom Chriſt never died. A part only are comprehended, 'a very few in compariſon, as we have reaſon to believe, or at 'leaſt to fear.' The Doctor, in his plan, has comprehended but very few, in compariſon. Many ſinners, many alas! has he left out of the covenant of redemption; or but very few are to be brought in, ſo as to become the *elect*, until the day of their death. His ſcheme is more limited, makes the death of Chriſt leſs efficacious, and gives to Chriſt not ſo many fruits of his glorious death, certainly with relation to this preſent life, as can be found among the writings of general eſteem, publiſhed during the laſt century. For if Satan be likely to ſhare the greateſt part of the prize until the end of the world, notwithſtanding the glorious ſtate of proſperity and univerſal holineſs among men, for a thouſand years yet to come; to the preſent day, it appears, he has kept nearly the whole, or more than an hundred to one, in a ſtate of damnation, as Dr. H. ſays, tormenting them by the cruel power of unſanctified nature.

And, in our author's language, it is by the fixed decree of God, that the great body of fallen men are involved in this doleful ſtate of ſin and damnation, and to continue in it till the day or moment of their death. At the diſſolution of ſoul and body, he pretends, all men are to have repentance, and every qualification requiſite to their eternal ſalvation. But, an exceeding ſmall number only is to enjoy the ſaving bleſſings of Chriſt's righteouſneſs, here in time, or before death commences.

All

* P. 138.

All this, as Dr. H argues, 'abſolutely depends on the choice, 'election, or decree, of the immutable Jehovah.' This at once turns his own words, with ſome alteration, againſt himſelf. 'God will certainly make ſuch as are elected to holineſs in this 'life, or to believe in time, by his own almighty power and 'grace, thus to believe. And he will moſt certainly leave all 'the reſt in a ſtate of unbelief and damnation, until the end of 'their days. For they never were comprehended in the decree 'of God or the covenant of redemption and ſalvation, ſo as to 'be brought in before their death.' Between Dr. H. and his opponents we ſee a wide difference relative to the coming world; but as to the preſent ſtate there is no difference, unleſs it be in favour of the latter. He extends the glorious work of God, and the covenant of his grace, ſo as to take in all at death, and to eternity; but, during this life, nearly the whole of mankind are left out, and by the immutable decree of Jehovah, as he argues.

The Doctor has, therefore, fallen into the ſame thing, in the nature of it, the ſame error of the firſt magnitude, as he calls it; and that which he every where imputes to the limitarians. It is the ſame, in kind, to be dependant on our Maker alone for deliverance from the power of ſin, and for every ſpiritual good, relative to time, as it is with relation to eternity, or time and eternity. In the nature of things, it is the ſame for God to decree that men ſhall be obedient and holy, ſo long as they live, or for an age, as it is for him to decree that men ſhall be obedient and holy to interminable ages. That God ſhould 'chooſe 'Pharaoh to be an example of great obſtinacy, rather than Mo-'ſes,' either for a certain period of time, or without end, is the ſame, in the nature of things. It is alſo the ſame, in kind, it has the ſame ſort of influence upon us as to moral obligation, and lays the ſame foundation for our faith, for us to know God has predeſtinated us to holineſs and happineſs, or to know he has predeſtinated us to ſin and miſery, for one day, as if it were for two days; for two days, as for four days; and ſo on without end. Again, it has the ſame kind of influence upon us, and lays the ſame foundation for our faith, for us not to know, for the matter to be wholly a ſecret to us, whether God has either predeſtinated us to holy obedience or the oppoſite, for one day, as if it were for two days; for two days, as if it were for four days, ten days, and ſo on to eternity. Theſe things are ſo plain no one can deny them. Therefore, in order for us to have a proper foundation laid for our faith, in order for us to believe

in

in Chriſt for eternal life, if, in this caſe, it be neceſſary for us to know we are elected to eternal life; then for us to have a proper foundation laid for our faith in Chriſt and obedience to him, here in this world, it is neceſſary for us to know we are elected to it, as to this world. On the other hand, if it be wholly a ſecret to us, whether we are 'elected to inward ſaving conſola-'tion in this world' or not, and we, at the ſame time, are under infinite obligation to believe in Jeſus, and ſerve him without fear, in holineſs and righteouſneſs all the days of our life, having the moſt ample warrant ſo to do; then we have the ſame ample warrant to believe in Jeſus for eternal life; although it be a profound ſecret to us whether we are elected to eternal life or not.

But Dr. H. ſays, 'When upon the limitarian plan, I know 'not that one tenth part of them, or even one of them was ever 'included in the covenant of redemption, or given to Chriſt, 'or that he ever died for one ſoul of them.' As the Doctor has reprobated ſuch a vaſt number of the human race, and left 'Satan to ſhare the greateſt part of the prize, until the end of 'this preſent world,' abiding ſtill by his own rules, he cannot tell that 'even one of them he has reprobated was ever included—, or given to Chriſt; to be employed in his ſervice, during this life. But 'ought I not to have known,' he adds, 'for 'whom among them Chriſt did indeed die, before I gave out 'this doctrine; and then to have addreſſed the ſame to them 'only? or ought I not, at leaſt, to have ſpoken hypothetically 'and ſaid; *if you are of the number of the elect*, you have 'full warrant and ground to believe to ſalvation. Otherwiſe 'there is no foundation laid in Chriſt for your faith; but, on the 'contrary, you will make God a liar in ſo believing, as you 'will believe what he knows is not true, viz. that every ſoul 'that hears the goſpel has a foundation for his ſaving faith, laid 'in Chriſt?' Thus the Doctor's rule of faith: We muſt know we are of the number of the elect; unleſs we have this knowledge there is no ground for our faith. Granting this to be true in one caſe, it muſt be granted in another, and in every caſe. Granting it as to our eternal ſalvation, as Dr. H. here intends it, and the point is given as to our preſent enjoyment of God. Therefore, do we know we are elected to fear God, and to enjoy his holy preſence, while in this life, we have then full warrant and ground to believe it; otherwiſe there is no foundation laid in Chriſt for our faith, as to this intereſting event; nor any door open for us to ſeek after it. But, on Dr. H's plan, it is

utterly

utterly impoſſible for impenitent ſinners to know they are elected to love God and to believe in Jeſus, ever until the awful moment of their death. How is it poſſible for any impenitent ſinner to know he is thus elected, and to enjoy the ſaving benefit of it previous to his death; ſince God has, if Dr. H's words be true, poſitively ordained ſo many to remain impenitent until their dying hour? How is it poſſible for 'all men every where' to know they are predeſtinated to love God, and ſerve him daily, while they live, when, as Dr. H. has taught us, Heaven has ordained to the contrary?

If our own previous knowledge be eſſential, in one caſe, to conſtitute a proper ground of faith; then our own previous knowledge is eſſential in another caſe, to conſtitute a proper ground of faith. And if our own knowledge make a part of the ground of our faith in Chriſt, and there be no ground of faith in him without this knowledge, in one caſe, it muſt be the ſame in all caſes. There is but *one faith*, and but one ground of faith. One and the ſame faith in praying for our daily bread, as in praying for the bread of eternal life; and the ſame ground of faith in both caſes. No one can ſuppoſe there are two kinds of ſaving faith. Neither can it be ſuppoſed there are two different grounds, or foundations, for us to build our faith upon. Whatever this foundation is ſuppoſed to be, all muſt grant it is unalterably the ſame, and with reference to all things, whether temporal or eternal. So that, whether our faith be exerciſed as to temporal or eternal things, it is built on the ſame foundation. Dr. H. makes it an eſſential part of the ground of our faith in Jeſus, for eternal life, for us to have previous knowledge that we are choſen in him to eternal life. As we have ſeen, he aſſerts that there is no propriety in preaching the goſpel to all men, only upon the previous aſſurance that all will be ſaved. And the above objection againſt the limitarians, he thinks is unanſwerable. Becauſe they do not know all men are thus choſen in Chriſt, they cannot invite all men to believe in Chriſt; as in this caſe there is no foundation for all men to have ſaving faith. And becauſe they hold that many are predeſtinated to eternal death, and who theſe are they cannot tell; they, of courſe, cannot invite any *one* to eſcape this death, and lay hold on life. But this objection only turns againſt the Doctor. *He* muſt know all men are choſen to the obedience of faith, in this life, and during their lives; elſe he cannot invite all men to this obedience. For he will not preſume there are two kinds of goſpel faith, or two different foundations of faith. And becauſe

he holds that ſo many are predeſtinated to live in ſin, all their days, and who they are, among ſuch as are now impenitent, he cannot tell; therefore, on his own plan, he can invite to repentance not one impenitent ſinner.

Thus, my dear Sir, Dr. H. has cut off every ſoul, who now is, or ſhall hereafter be born into the world, 'under the damnable power of impenitence,' as he calls it, from every ground of hope, and encouragement to ſeek after ſpiritual comfort, as to this life. All who are of this character, he would have them be content to remain ſo, until they have paſſed through the dark valley, and the king of terrors has done for them his laſt office. On his plan, and making his words accord with his own ſcheme, they can be addreſſed only in ſuch language as this. '*If you are of the number of the elect,*' or if you know, that which is now impoſſible for you to know, that you are elected to holineſs and happineſs, for time as well as for eternity, 'you have full warrant and ground to believe it. Otherwiſe there is no foundation laid in Chriſt for your faith,' or preſent belief; 'but, on the contrary, you will make God a liar in ſo believing, as you will believe what he knows is not true, viz. that every ſoul that hears the goſpel has a foundation for his ſaving faith,' to be exerciſed immediately, 'laid in Chriſt.'

How is it poſſible for the Doctor to profeſs ſuch freedom and boldneſs, in urging men to the performance of every chriſtian duty? And how can he eſteem his the only conſiſtent plan, on which goſpel obedience may be required, as an *immediate* duty, from every creature? Having eſtabliſhed his main point, as he imagines, he proceeds to ſay, 'I can now preach the goſpel to every creature; i. e. I can tell every creature under heaven, '*Good news* to him, I can tell every human creature of a Savior as complete to give him the *qualification*, as to make the '*atonement*; to give repentance as well as forgiveneſs of ſins, 'alike engaging and enſuring both, by covenant with his Father.'* The queſtion is, when has Chriſt engaged this, or when will he give repentance as well as forgiveneſs to every human creature? And the Doctor's anſwer is, when they come to die, and not before. Which is the ſame as telling every impenitent ſinner to put off repentance till that time. For the whole drift of his argument is, we are not to attempt any duty, nor ſeek for any thing, unleſs we are previouſly certain Chriſt has engaged to give it. But 'on this ground,' Dr. H. adds, 'I can charge any 'unbeliever with the greateſt blame, for not believing *immediately*

* P. 13.

'*ately* to the saving of his soul, i. e. to a sense and enjoyment 'of gospel salvation.'* Where is the blame, on this plan, for not believing immediately, unless every one previously knows he is chosen in Christ, to believe immediately? And how can Dr. H. 'tell every human creature under heaven, *Good news* '*to him*,' bringing 'the saving enjoyment' home to his soul this day? How can he openly declare, 'All things are now ready;' when, as he has taught us, if all do not know they are of the number of the elect, and elected to present enjoyment of the gospel feast, one most essential article is wanting?

Dr. H. says again, 'On the limitarian plan, I can charge no sin-'ner with any thing amiss, for not believing to his own salvation; 'unless I first know, that he is one that is comprehended in their 'partial and much limited covenant of redemption.'* He again brings in his established rule: 'Unless I first know, that he is 'one that is comprehended,' &c. Strongly implying the necessity of our knowing that we are elected to eternal life, and without this knowledge there is no door open for us to seek after eternal life. The consequence is undeniable, that there is then no door open for us to seek after reconciliation to God, and communion with him, in this life, unless we are assured God has chosen us to it. Some of the Doctor's words, however, are well chosen; that is, to be improved against himself.—'*Partial* '*and much limited covenant of redemption!*'—What plan can be found, throughout christendom, more partial and limited than his? It is granted, his plan is pretended to be so extensive as to admit every human creature, in the world to come. But, while in this world, every impenitent sinner is excluded, none have a foundation laid in Christ to believe and enjoy the blessing, for the present time, except such as know they are elected to it, for the present time. And not one impenitent sinner can know this. Therefore, his plan excludes every one of this character, as far as relates to this life. And he 'can charge no 'sinner with any thing amiss, for not believing *immediately*, to 'a sense and enjoyment of gospel salvation.'

It will now be objected, The limitarians hold that Christ has not died to save all men, and that the *atonement* is not sufficient for all. And as they hold that many are ordained by God for endless misery, this proves that Christ has not died for all, and that the atonement, in this case, is insufficient. Therefore, there is not provision made, in their scheme, so as to invite every creature to believe in Jesus. For how can every one be invited, when provision is made only for a part?

Answer,

* P. 14, 15.

Anſwer. That the atonement is ſufficient for the whole human race, and that Chriſt taſted death, in a certain ſenſe, and in an important ſenſe, for every man: for this ſee in Let. I, II. Part IV. That Chriſt died, however, with a poſitive determination to ſave only a part, alſo that many are ordained by God for endleſs miſery, is no objection againſt the fulneſs of the atonement. That God 'hath mercy on whom he will, and whom 'he will, he hardeneth,'* does not argue the atonement to be inſufficient for the whole. Neither does it argue that offers of grace cannot be conſiſtently made to every creature.

Dr. H. thinks it does. And on this ground he argues his own ſcheme. But he only argues againſt himſelf. Granting this objection to be well founded, it clearly follows, if the great majority of mankind, as he ſays, are ordained by God to be diſtreſſed with the awful ſlavery of ſin, all their days, then Chriſt has not died to ſave all men from this evil: Then the atonement, in this caſe, is inſufficient for all: Then proviſion, in this caſe, is made only for a part: Then how can every one be invited, when proviſion is made only for a part? This is taking the argument in the Doctor's own line. His reaſoning is, if a part of mankind be marked out, by God, for eternal death, then the *atonement* is not ſufficient for to ſave this part of mankind from this death; therefore the *atonement* is not ſufficient for all men. 'The e-'ternal, perſonal damnation of one human ſoul,' he ſays, 'would 'caſt a great reflection on the full and complete atonement of the 'Son of God's love.'† But hereby he impliedly ſays, if God have marked out ſome of mankind to be left in rebellion againſt him all their days, as he aſſerts God has, then proviſion is not made by the atonement to keep theſe, ſo marked out, from this rebellion. Then this portion of mankind cannot be commanded and invited, in this caſe. And who theſe are among the impenitent he cannot tell. Neither can he ſelect any one, ſo as to apply the goſpel invitation to him. He has cut himſelf off from inviting every impenitent ſinner to turn from ſin.

For the LORD to harden Pharaoh's heart, or leave Pharaoh to harden his own heart, and puniſh him for it, is the ſame, in the nature of the caſe, whether it be done in this or the next world. Dr. H. profeſſes to agree with his opponents, in every ſenſe, as to the agency and ſovereignty of Jehovah; and the free agency and accountableneſs of men. But he ſays, if Pharaoh's heart be hardened, and he puniſhed, in the next world, this implies that there was not merit enough in Chriſt's blood to prevent this evil,

* Rom. 9. 18. † P. 317.

vil. In addition to what has been cited, Dr. H. has ſeveral expreſſions to this amount, as we ſhall yet ſee. Which is ſaying, at the ſame time, that Chriſt's blood was not meritorious enough, and no adequate proviſion made by the atonement, to keep Pharaoh from ſin and puniſhment, while in this life. Therefore, as Dr. H. ſtill argues, if there was not adequate proviſion ſo as to prevent Pharaoh's ſin, in this life, then there was no foundation laid for him to turn from ſin and turn his heart to fear the LORD, and truſt in the Meſſiah. Of courſe, Dr. H. has releaſed Pharaoh from all moral obligation. He cannot charge Pharaoh, nor any other hardened ſinner, with any thing amiſs.

Thus, my dear Friend, we have the eſſence of Dr. H's *good news*. All fear of puniſhment is taken away, and a great ſhew of happineſs is made, as to the coming world. But no proviſion is made for ſinners to turn from ſin, and enjoy the purchaſe of Chriſt's death, while in this world. While in this world, ſinners are releaſed from all moral obligation, and left to indulge, without remorſe of conſcienee, in every ſinful pleaſure. *Good news* indeed! moſt gratifying to the wicked; but grievous to the righteous. Some further account may be given of this, in our next Letter.

I am, &c.

LETTER II.

Dr. H's foundation of faith further examined, compared, &c.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

DR. Huntington's given rule of faith implies that we muſt have certain knowledge of obtaining the object, before we can, with propriety, try to obtain it, or ſet our hearts to ſeek after it. We muſt alſo have certain knowledge that God has decreed we ſhall obtain the object, whether we ſeek after it before death overtakes us, or not.

'Regeneration, repentance, faith, love, hope, joy, every vir-'tue, and every good work wrought in us, or exerciſed by us,' ſays he, 'are all ſo many fit and neceſſary ſteps, which the al-'mighty Redeemer takes with human ſouls, to acquaint them 'with his meritorious impetration, give them comfort in it, and 'affect them ſuitably by it in their hearts and lives. There is no 'ſtrict propriety in preaching any of theſe doctrines *as goſpel*,

'i. e.

'i. e. as news founded in facts, that ought to be believed; unleſs all is made true and ſure in Chriſt before we have any acquaintance with the tidings, or any operation from them.'* In connection with 'the meritorious impetration' of Chriſt, the Doctor enumerates, as we ſee, the various graces given by the holy Spirit, and duties enjoined on men in the goſpel. This is the news founded in facts, that ought 'to be believed.' We ought to believe that 'regeneration, repentance, faith, love,' and 'every chriſtian duty required of us, is 'made true and ſure in 'Chriſt, before we have any acquaintance with the tidings.' Not only ſo he aſſerts that 'there is no propriety in preaching any of 'theſe doctrines,' viz. repentance, faith, love, &c. 'unleſs all 'is made true and ſure in Chriſt before we have any operation 'from them.' But if there be no propriety in preaching any of theſe doctrines, then ſurely there is no propriety in believing them, unleſs all is previouſly made certain, or predetermined by Chriſt to be wrought in us. Therefore, there is no propriety in believing we ought to have repentance, except we can firſt believe that God has determined to give us repentance. All muſt firſt be made ſure in Chriſt, or the preaching of theſe things is in vain. Hence, it follows that the firſt and great object in preaching the goſpel is to declare this aſſurance. The firſt thing, therefore to be believed is this aſſurance in Chriſt, and that he is determined to work in us every good work. Dr. H. here plainly teaches that it is in vain to ſeek after a new heart, or ſet our hearts to turn to the LORD, except we can firſt be aſſured he has determined to give us a new heart.

In connection with this, he ſays, 'When the doctrine of repentance is preached for the remiſſion of ſins, this remiſſion is 'always ſure in Chriſt.'† His meaning muſt be, when Chriſt and his miniſters call on ſinners to repent, that their ſins might be forgiven, this implies an aſſurance that their ſins ſhall be forgiven. To this the Doctor adds, 'Repentance as a fit temper 'of mind to receive it and enjoy the benefit, is alſo engaged by 'him, who orders the doctrine to be preached.'† Repentance is accordingly engaged, as well as remiſſion of ſins, and always engaged whenever ſinners are called on to repent. And Dr. H. ſays, 'When all men are commanded every where to repent, the 'very command implies, that this is made ſure, and all the bene-'fits connected with it.'‡ But if the preaching of the goſpel muſt carry in it this aſſurance, otherwiſe it is not goſpel to be believed, then ſinners cannot profit by it except they firſt embrace this aſſurance. They muſt be certain God has determined

* P. 131. † † P. 130. ‡ P. 129.

ed to give them repentance before they can ſet their hearts to this duty.

Again, Dr. H. applies Rom. v. 10. to all men, without exception. By the death of Chriſt, as he interprets, 'Every human creature is reconciled to God, and God to them.'* 'And much more being reconciled, i. e. moſt evidently and certainly, as he lives an almighty and faithful Savior, to make application of the benefits of redemption, to give repentance to his redeemed (called his Iſrael) and forgiveneſs of ſins.' The whole human race he calls God's 'Iſrael,' becauſe 'every human creature is reconciled to God, and God to them.' So that he conſiders it 'moſt evidently and certainly' determined, and as the moſt obvious truth in the Bible, that Chriſt will give repentance, as well as forgiveneſs of ſins, to all mankind. And, as we have ſeen, he calls it 'utter inconſiſtency to preach the goſpel on any other ground than this.' It is of courſe utter inconſiſtency to believe the goſpel, or pay regard to it, except we can firſt realize what he terms this great and moſt obvious truth, that Chriſt has engaged to give repentance to every human creature.

Thus far Dr. H's rule of faith: We muſt have certain knowledge of obtaining the object before we can, with propriety, try to obtain it, or ſet our hearts to ſeek after it. But this rule ſhuts impenitent ſinners out from the faith, and fixes them all in infidelity. An appeal may be made to the conſcience of every man, ſaint and ſinner, for the truth of this. Who can ſay, 'The very command' to faith and hope carries in it certain knowledge to his own mind, that God will hereafter, or in ſome future moment, give him this faith and hope? Who can ſay, and before he has ever ſet his heart to it, he is certain God will give him repentance? But, for the want of this certain knowledge, ſinners are here inſtructed to remain as they are, ſhut out from the faith, and ſhut out of the kingdom of grace. Every attempt to humble themſelves before the Moſt High, and implore his grace, without this certain knowledge, is utter inconſiſtency. Every attempt to believe in Jeſus for ſalvation, unleſs they are firſt certain he has determined they ſhall ſo believe, is in vain. And as long as they wait to have this aſſurance, as a foundation for their repentance and faith, ſo long they will certainly remain impenitent.

It will now be objected that the Doctor's meaning is not to make this knowledge the firſt thing, or that there can be no exerciſe of repentance and faith without it. Although this certain knowledge is neceſſary to make faith complete, or, more properly, to make one ſtrong in the faith; yet a man may have ſome low degree of faith without it. Anſwer.

* P. 130.

Answer. Then the gospel may be preached in some low degree without it. Which is a contradiction to the Doctor's express words. *Utter inconsistency!*—no degree of it can be preached, no part or branch of it can be taught, neither can sinners be urged to one gospel duty; 'unless all is made true and sure in 'Christ before they have any acquaintance with the tidings.'

Again, it will be objected, The Doctor's meaning is that faith is a complex exercise, or several truths come into view to make it what it is. Several truths respecting Christ and the way of life by him, as his divinity, his humanity, and the offices he sustains as Mediator; all of which are necessary to be received, to make faith what it is. But which of these must first strike the mind, is immaterial. In like manner, although this certain knowledge be necessary, to make faith complete, yet it is not necessarily the first thing; neither does it follow that there can be no attempts made by sinners towards faith and repentance, without it.

Answer. Neither does it follow that there can be no attempts made in preaching the word, and urging sinners to these duties, without it. Which is the same contradiction again.

It will further be objected, That the Doctor's meaning is only to establish the certainty of sinners repentance, as a truth or event determined by Christ, and which is so clearly contained in the gospel; being also one most essential part of the gospel, without which the gospel is not gospel; but not so essential and necessary for sinners to believe; it is immaterial whether they believe it, or not.

Answer. It is then immaterial whether it is preached or not. Of course the gospel may be truly preached, and this doctrine wholly omitted. Which is a third contradiction to the Doctor's words. Furthermore, this objection, of itself, is a contradiction to the Doctor's express words. 'There is no strict propriety in 'preaching any of these doctrines *as gospel*, i. e. as news founded in facts, *that ought to be believed*; unless all is made 'true and sure in Christ before we have any operation from them.' As we have seen, by 'these doctrines' he means, among other things, 'regeneration, repentance,——every good work 'wrought in us, or exercised by us.' And this 'news must be 'founded in facts;' it must be a fact or certainty that Christ will give repentance to every sinner; else there is no propriety in preaching or believing—else no sinner 'ought to believe these doctrines *as gospel*.' However the preaching of the cross may be stated, except it is made certain that Christ will work in sinners, in all

men,

men, every good work, ſinners ought not to believe it as goſpel, or as good news. The plain language is, theſe are not only *facts*, or certainties, as contained in the bible, but they are facts to be made known. And unleſs they are made known, the words of the bible are not good news to men; neither are men under obligation to receive them, as ſuch. For if men are releaſed from obligation to believe the bible, provided it does not indeed contain theſe facts, and it is binding on them provided it does, then how is it thus binding on them, except, at the ſame time, they have been certified of theſe facts? If theſe facts make the ſcripture binding on men, then men muſt and do come to the knowledge of theſe facts, or how are they bound by them? How are men bound by certain things, and under ſacred obligation to obedience, except theſe certain things are made known to them? Therefore, if men are releaſed from obligation to the goſpel, as Dr. H. ſays, unleſs his news founded in facts is preached to them, then his news muſt be preached to them before they can be brought under obligation to it. Therefore ſinners muſt firſt hear and know this *news*, and before they are bound to believe the goſpel, any part of it, as ſuch. They muſt hear the news of the ſalvation of all men, and know that Chriſt has decreed the repentance of all men, before they are bound to repent.

Dr. H. conſiders this certainty, that Chriſt will give ſaving grace to all men, the only thing which makes revelation binding, ſo *that it ought to be believed*. For, to omit this certainty, there is no propriety in preaching, but utter inconſiſtency; and, of courſe, no propriety in believing, but utter inconſiſtency, in every attempt towards it. Alſo, to omit this certainty, there is not only no propriety in preaching, but there can be no preaching that ought to be believed. But the only thing which makes revelation binding on men muſt firſt be certified to men, elſe how can revelation command their belief? Therefore, ſinners muſt know what Chriſt has determined to do for them, before they are bound to obey him. They muſt certainly know Chriſt has decreed they ſhall have faith, before they ought to have it. Alſo all attempts to any goſpel duty, without this certain knowledge, are utterly inconſiſtent.

This further confirms the remarks in our firſt Letter. On Dr. H's ground, men muſt aſcertain their *election* to the ſeveral religious duties of this preſent life, before they become obligated to do them. Therefore, when Dr. H. ſays, 'If you are of the 'number of the elect, you have full warrant to believe to ſalva-'tion,' this is pertinent as to the preſent life as well as to the fu-

ture. Are men commanded to make themſelves new hearts? they muſt recognize that they are elected to this, before this command can take effect upon them. Are men commanded to love God with all their heart? this command can have no authority over them, until they are aſſured God has determined to give them this heart to love him. Does God command all men, wherever the word of his grace comes, to repent, and believe on his Son Jeſus Chriſt? this command is in force when all men know God has decreed their obedience to it, and not before. This is the reſult of the Doctor's reaſoning, and this is his rule of faith. If it is not, how does the doctrine of the remiſſion of ſins, when preached, always makes this remiſſion ſure in Chriſt? How does the very command imply that repentance is made ſure, and all the benefits connected with it? How is repentance always engaged by him, who orders the doctrine to be preached? And how is all preaching, and all exertions as to believing, utterly in vain, on any other ground than this?

But the remainder of the Doctor's addreſs to ſinners is, 'You 'will make God a liar in ſo believing, as you will believe what he knows is not true, viz. that every ſoul that hears the goſpel has a foundation for his ſaving faith, laid in Chriſt:' i. e. except they firſt aſcertain their election by Chriſt to ſalvation. This can be improved no other than a ſolemn warning to ſinners, that they lay aſide all attempts to turn to God, to truſt in Jeſus, or rejoice before him, until they are certain they are elected to it. And a ſolemn warning to ſinners not to turn and believe in Jeſus immediately, nor in any future moment, unleſs they can firſt be aſſured he has determined to give them an heart to it, and to this identical act of belief. Dr. H. has accordingly ſhut up the kingdom of heaven againſt men. For he ſays 'the great majority' of men are left under the power of ſin, and this by the 'decree 'of the immutable Jehovah.' In ſo ſaying he has declared that no ſinner can realize his 'news founded in facts,' ſo as to enjoy the ſaving benefit of them in this preſent ſtate. Not one impenitent ſinner can know he is elected to fear God and taſte the power of his love, while on this ſide the grave. How can he know he is elected to it, when, in the Doctor's words, the decree of the immutable Jehovah has left the great majority in the oppoſite? Therefore, ſinners muſt know what is impoſſible for them to know, 'otherwiſe they have no foundation for their faith,—otherwiſe 'they will make God a liar in ſo believing.' If this does not ſhut up the *kingdom* againſt men, it is impoſſible to ſay what does.

Thus, my dear Sir, we again have Dr. H's. very extraordinary rule of faith. Men muſt know what is impoſſible for them

to

to know, before they have any ground for their belief. Which effectually excludes ſinners from the faith, and ſhuts up the door of hope againſt men; conſequently this rule deſtroys itſelf.

Dr. H. further extends his foundation of faith. We muſt not only be certain of obtaining the object, before we ſeek after it, but we muſt be certain that God has determined we ſhall obtain it, whether we ſeek after it before death overtakes us, or not. He often mentions God's own due time; when this time comes, the great work of grace is done, for every child of Adam. But, the queſtion is, when will this *due time* come? Chriſt engages to give remiſſion of ſins, and the benefits connected with it, to every human creature. But when does he fulfil this engagement? The Doctor has fixed upon no time before we meet the king of terrors, on which we can all aſſuredly depend. At death, he tells us, the great bleſſing is given to every one. Or all who are found unregenerate when the pale meſſenger arreſts them, are then renewed, ſanctified, and fitted for heaven. And he agrees with his opponents, that the unregenerate never do ſeek after repentance and remiſſion of ſins; but always *refuſe and rebel*. He alſo holds that the great body of men die in their ſins, or death finds them in this ſtate; and, therefore, they never ſeek ſalvation, during this life. See Let. III. Part I. But this certain knowledge of the determinate will of Chriſt, to give ſalvation to all men, we muſt have; otherwiſe our faith is vain. Conſequently, we muſt not only be certain of obtaining the object, before we ſeek after it, but we muſt be certain of obtaining of it, whether we ſeek after it in this life or not. And this completes the Doctor's precept of faith. We ſhall cloſe this Letter with the following remarks.

1. Dr. H's great zeal in pretending to ſuch a fulneſs of proviſion for loſt ſinners, as to the next world, appears to be a falſe zeal. For his ſcheme makes no proviſion as to this world. His pretended wide door, which would finally admit all in, is ſhut for the preſent; not one ſoul can ever enter, before ſoul and body are ſeperated. His zeal for the ſalvation of men, in the next ſtate, has effectually cut off poor loſt ſinners from all ground to hope for 'ſaving conſolation,' in this ſtate; and barr'd the door of hope againſt them. How can this zeal be genuine, which ſtretches ſo far beyond the line of truth? The Holy Ghoſt ſaith, 'Behold I, have ſet before thee an open door, and no man can 'ſhut it.'* 'Behold, now is the accepted time.'†

It is granted that the Doctor might not fully underſtand his own ſcheme. He might not ſee all the conſequences of his leading principles; and therefore might not intend all the ſame things, which

* Rev. 3. 8. † 2 Cor. 6. 2

which naturally reſult from them. To maintain his grand point, however, he appears to be neceſſitated to adopt ſuch falſe maxims as do, indeed, 'ſhut up the kingdom of heaven againſt men.' Leaving them no room to hope, excepting thoſe who find themſelves already in, that they ever ſhall enter till after death. On his plan, ſuch as are truly deſirous of being heirs of the kingdom, and of cleaving to the LORD with all their heart, or ſuch as are upon the point of entering in, cannot unleſs they firſt know they are *elected*, or unleſs they firſt know what they cannot know. There are frequent inſtances of perſons having a good work begun in their ſouls, who have no evidence in their own minds that they were choſen of God, before the world was. Dr. H. himſelf owns this, and then denies it. But what kind of zeal is this, which denies the firſt principles of the oracles of God?

There can be no heſitation in granting, whoever ſeeks in a goſpel line muſt have an unſhaken belief in the power of the Redeemer, and his readineſs to give whatever we aſk agreeably to his will. 'He that cometh to God muſt believe that he is, and *that* he is a 'rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him.'* But there is a wide difference between our believing God to be able and willing to give whatever we *diligently* ſeek to him for, and, on the contrary, knowing all to be made true and ſure to us in Chriſt before we ſeek to him for it, and even true and ſure to us whether we ever ſeek to him for it in this life, or not. There cannot be a wider difference than there is between theſe two propoſitions. The former ſuppoſes, if we aſk of God with a pure heart, we ſhall receive; but if we aſk amiſs, or do not aſk at all, we ſhall not receive. The latter ſuppoſes, whether we aſk amiſs, whether we make no pretenſions to aſking, or whether we aſk of God with a pure heart, it is all one,—all is made ſure to us in Chriſt. The latter breaks down all diſtinction between him that ſerveth God, and him that ſerveth him not.†

It will now be aſked, whether our ſtriving, or ſeeking, or whether the act of the creature, can alter the eternal fixed purpoſe of the Moſt High? This objection, if it be of weight, lies with equal force againſt the Doctor. For how can he 'charge every unbe-'liever with the greateſt blame, for not believing immediately to 'the ſaving of his ſoul,' ſeeing 'the great majority,' as he ſays, are left, while in this ſtate, by the fixed purpoſe of the Moſt High, to live in rebellion againſt him? This objection, if traced to its ſource, will appear to be an inſult to common ſenſe. For what man will preſume to ſay, If my daily bread be decreed by Heaven, I ſhall have it, otherwiſe I ſhall not; therefore I will quietly

* Heb. 11. 6. † Mal. 3. 18.

quietly ſit down in a ſtate of inactivity? In God's great plan, the means and the end are inſeparable. If he decrees the end, he alſo decrees the means, to accompliſh it. Therefore, if in every caſe, we do not uſe the means God has appointed, we may be aſſured we ſhall not obtain the end. But,

2. Dr. H's ſcheme is calculated in the moſt direct manner to ſuit the carnal heart, in all the depth of iniquity. Sinners have, for ages, endeavoured to ſcreen and excuſe themſelves from obligation to God, under a notion *that they do not know they are of the number of the elect; that the door of hope is ſhut againſt them, for the preſent; that it is ſufficient for them to believe to ſalvation when God's time ſhall come, neither can they do it before; that if God has decreed their ſalvation, he will bring them in, even at death, if not ſooner.* What can be more gratifying to their carnal deſires than that which meets their vain pleas and excuſes? What more pleaſing than to be told, They are excuſed for the preſent, the door of mercy is now ſhut againſt them, but it ſhall moſt aſſuredly be opened to them at laſt, and they indeed brought in? Every hardened ſinner who has ſome notion that the bible is true, or that there will be a future judgment, muſt exult with infernal pleaſure, if he can bring his mind to acquieſce in ſuch a flattering excuſe as is here given, for him to revel all his days in ſin. And he having, at the ſame time, an aſſurance of being delivered, at laſt, from the torments of hell, and made conſumately happy. This is the thing which his ſoul has been luſting after.

That all are elected, as to the future world; but few elected, as to this; that no unbeliever can know he is elected to ſerve God, while he continues in this world; that all ground of faith and obligation to duty, while he continues in this world, is therefore taken away; that the ſinner has therefore ſuch a plauſible excuſe to live as he liſteth, and to do it with perfect ſafety, having the brighteſt proſpect before him; what can be more ſoothing to the deceitful heart? That which ſinners have ſo long ſought after, God in righteous judgment, it ſeems, has ſent upon them. 'I alſo will chooſe their deluſions, and will bring their fears upon them; becauſe when I called, none did anſwer.'* But,

3. However Dr. H's notion, that without certain knowledge we are elected, we have no warrant for our faith, may, by its natural conſequences, be gratifying to the wicked, it is grievous to the righteous. However it may feaſt and raviſh the carnal appetite, it is wounding to the pious ſoul. The pious ſoul often ſeeks after that ſpiritual enjoyment, to which he has no knowledge or certainty

* Iſai. 66. 4.

certainty of being elected, or that God will beſtow it upon him. Here it is neceſſary to obſerve, there is a material difference between *hoping* and *knowing*. Although the terms be ſometimes uſed promiſcouſly, yet, in a ſtrict ſenſe, there is an eſſential difference. There are alſo various degrees of what is often called certain knowledge. The Doctor has ſtated the caſe in the ſuperlative degree. Beyond a doubt we muſt know all men are elected to ſalvation, or we have no warrant to invite every creature to believe to ſalvation. And beyond a doubt each individual muſt know he is thus elected, or the door of hope is barr'd againſt him. But David ſays, 'I ſink in deep mire, where there is no ſtanding: I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me. I am weary of my crying, my throat is dried: mine eyes fail while I wait for my God.'* David is here in the ſtrongeſt exerciſe of ſaving faith. But inſtead of having certain knowledge of obtaining the object, relative to his own perſon, even his hope is ready to fail him. 'I ſink in deep mire, where there is no ſtanding.' When David, by the conſpiracy of Abſalom, was driven out of Jeruſalem, he had no certain knowledge that God had decreed his return. But he had true faith in the Meſſiah; and prayed, as to this particular matter, and gave himſelf up in *the faith*. 'If I ſhall find favour in the eyes of the LORD, he will bring me again, and ſhow me his habitation. But if he thus ſay, I have no delight in thee: Behold, *here am* I, let him do to me as ſeemeth good unto him.'† David's faith reſted on a different foundation, from that which Dr. H. has ſhown us, as the only foundation.

Numerous inſtances might be cited, wherein the children of God have been ſeeking, with a *ſingle eye*, after things, which they had no poſitive certainty and but little hope of obtaining. The firſt thought, the firſt holy exerciſe, in the moment of regeneration, goes out to God, in the ſame kind of longing and thirſting after him as David ſo often expreſſes. The perſon, at that moment, has no aſſurance, or he may have none, of his being choſen to eternal life. We cannot ſuppoſe the thief on the croſs had poſitive evidence of future happineſs, before Chriſt told him, 'To day ſhalt thou be with me in paradiſe.' But previous to this he acknowledged the juſtice of God, took blame to himſelf, defended the innocent character of Jeſus, and prayed, 'Lord, remember me when thou comeſt into thy kingdom.'‡ Shall the kingdom of heaven be ſhut up againſt ſuch a perſon? Shall

* Pſal. 69. 2, 3. Altho' this Pſalm applies to Chriſt, yet David here ſpeaks from his own experience, and refers to Ahithophel &c. v. 22—28.

† 2 Sam. 15. 25, 26. ‡ Luke. 23. 40—43.

Shall he be told not to ſeek after preſent 'ſaving conſolation,' leſt he make God a liar, becauſe he does not know that all is firſt made ſure in Chriſt? Therefore, for the thirſting pious ſoul to have the door of mercy ſhut againſt him, ſo that he cannot take one ſtep towards the full enjoyment of God, unleſs he firſt have the aſſurance of his being elected to it, muſt wound him moſt ſenſibly indeed.

On our author's plan, the believer has no encouragement to preſs forward and ſtrive for further degrees of ſanctification. He cannot know he is elected, as to this life, to higher degrees of holineſs than what he now has. He cannot poſſibly know as to one ſingle exerciſe or enjoyment, which he is yet to have, before his departure out of time. But Dr. H. ſays, 'All is made 'true and ſure in Chriſt before we have any acquaintance with 'the tidings.' And Chriſt who orders theſe tidings to be preached, engages to give all theſe things, viz. 'faith, love, hope, joy, 'and every good work wrought in us, or exerciſed by us.' 'On 'any other ground than this,' all preaching and believing is in vain. And unleſs we know we are elected to the enjoyment of theſe things, we make God a liar in believing, or in ſeeking after them. But as the believer cannot know he is yet to have one more holy comforting exerciſe this ſide eternity, he cannot ſeek to God for it. So long as he continues in the body, the way is wholly cloſed up againſt his preſſing forward. He muſt ſit down, and mourn, and weep, and ſpread forth his hands, and there is none to comfort him! Although this, however, is ſo painful to the righteous ſoul, yet all the malice and cunning of ſatan could have deviſed nothing more gratifying to the proud deceitful heart.

4. Dr. H's ſcheme brings God and man upon a level; or rather the divine Being yields up the point in diſpute to ſinful man. For if man muſt firſt know all is made ſure in Chriſt, before he has any acquaintance with the tidings, or any operation from them; that is, without the leaſt condition or duty required on his part, it is eaſy to ſee which party yields. God and man were at the greateſt variance. God charged man with rebellion againſt him, and previouſly threatened him with the moſt awful curſe. On the Doctor's plan, God wholly remits the curſe, man muſt be told of this, with the promiſe of every poſſible bleſſing to him, even whether he continues in rebellion or not. And unleſs man is aſſured of this, he is under no obligation to return to his former allegiance to his God. In this caſe, every one ſees that God comes over to man's terms. Sinners have long been complaining—'We do not know that we are decreed for heaven. Did

'we

'we know we were thus choſen of God, we ſhould then have 'ſome encouragement to ſerve him; but now we have none; 'neither are we under obligation to take Chriſt's yoke upon us.' Dr. H's ſcheme coincides with their bitter murmurings; yea, he has put the very words into their mouths.

'On the *limitarian* plan, Dr. H. can charge no ſinner with 'any amiſs;' and becauſe no impenitent ſinner, on this plan, can be certain he is of the number of the elect. Therefore, as he conſiders it; every ſinner is in an innocent juſtified ſtate for not believing to his own ſalvation, until God makes known to him that his ſalvation is ſecured; and ſecured to him whether he repents and believes in Jeſus, or not during this life. This leads the ſinner to ſuppoſe, that, as he can be accepted of God only through a Mediator, God has no demand upon him, before he makes known to him that all is previouſly made certain in Chriſt. All the demand God has upon him, provided he have any, is in conſequence of his certifying to him that he is delivered from hell, and heaven forever made over to him. And as he can ſerve God but through a Mediator, which is the ſame as believing to eternal life, he will conclude he is under no kind of obligation to love and ſerve God, before all the bleſſings of heaven are made certain to him; and made certain to him, although he ſhould perſevere in ſin all his days. In this caſe which party yields? The curſe is ſet aſide, heaven is granted, and the ſinner left to live as he liſteth, to the end of life. Certainly God yields up the whole point in diſpute, & without the ſinner's turning from his rebellion.

5. Dr. H's ſcheme argues that men, ſince the intervention of the Meſſiah, are not in a probationary ſtate. A ſtate of probation implies that life and death are ſuſpended on the conduct of the creature; or the conduct of the creature, in this caſe, is made a condition. We know of no other ſtate of trial for accountable creatures, as ſtanding in relation to their God. Thus it was with angels; life and death were ſuſpended upon their conduct. And thus it was with Adam; life and death were ſet before him; which of theſe would be his fate, his own conduct was to decide. Since the fall of man, Dr. H. ſays the ſecond Adam has aſſumed the place of man, and acted and ſuffered in his ſtead; and not only offers life to all men, but has actually ſecured the life of all men. Admitting this, and why is life and death ſet before us? But admitting eternal life is actually ſecured to all men, and they are all releaſed from their ſtate of trial; here can be no further trial, nor condition after the grand object, and even *all* is made ſure. And if life be made certain to all men, ſo that, from their birth

to

to their departure out of time, their conduct cannot make it void, then their ſtate of exiſtence during time is not a ſtate of probation. It cannot be a ſtate of probation as to life and death, becauſe theſe are not ſuſpended upon it. This is an eſſential article in Dr. H's ſcheme, as we may yet ſee.

6. Our author, with veneration and confidence, avows moſt of the leading principles in the calvinian ſyſtem. He has treated the doctrine of the divine decrees, however, in ſuch a manner as tends greatly to injure the cauſe of truth;—to releaſe ſinners from accountableneſs to God, and make them look like mere machines. 'If innumerable of the offspring of God,' ſays he, 'or even any 'number of them, are in extreme ſufferings to endleſs duration, 'in this caſe, they muſt be infinite loſers by that exiſtence, which 'the God of love forced upon them.'* To have a juſt idea of this, and other things of like kind in his book, it is neceſſary to obſerve that he thinks ſome men are vaſtly more miſerable in this life than others; that in this life the wicked ſuffer the full reward of their evil deeds; that they have a diminiſhed ſtate of happineſs in the next world, proportionate to their evil deeds in this. See Let. IV. V. VII. Part I. When, therefore, hardened ſinners find themſelves in extreme ſufferings, and when, provided they credit the Doctor, they ſee a diminutive ſtate of happineſs before them to eternity, all this their perverſe hearts, if not their mouths, will ſay, 'The God of love has forced upon them.' The Doctor has put the words into their mouths. Although, according to his plan they may expect not to be loſers, on the whole, by their exiſtence, yet they will conclude they are forced below, far below their fellow creatures, both in time and eternity. And whatever our author may ſay of divine juſtice, and however he may contradict himſelf the next breath, yet he has here ſuggeſted that God cannot juſtly hold ſinners in extreme ſuffering to endleſs duration; but this would be a forced, arbitrary, and unjuſt act. By the ſame rule, the proud and haughty will ſay it is a forced and unjuſt act in God, to puniſh them in the manner he does, in this world, and aſſign them to a lower ſtate of happineſs, in the next. Alſo the very exiſtence of ſinners, the continuation of their exiſtence, with all their thoughts and actions, appear agreeably to the Doctor's words, to be forced upon them by their Maker. Inſtead of keeping up the idea of their voluntary oppoſition againſt God, and that they are active in hardening their own hearts, he has charged God with forcing exiſtence upon them. And in ſuch manner as has a very ſtrong appearance that God decrees them, and actually makes them ſinners, contrary to

 their

* P. 301.

their own wiſhes. The greateſt part he has ſaid on the divine decrees bears a like complexion. Which caſts no little contempt on the ſupreme being, and reduces the perverſeneſs of tranſgreſſors to an empty name.

Again, he evidently holds that men are under no obligation to ſubmit to the divine decrees, until they know them to be in their favour. He ſays, 'The divine will, purpoſe, elec-'tion, decree, predeſtination, or by whatever term you would 'ſignify the eternal, immutable plan of Jehovah, does, every 'where in the word of God, fully ſecure the certain happineſs 'of all the human race, after death.'* When we can view the divine decrees in this light, as he argues, it is our duty to embrace and love them, otherwiſe it is not. 'The hearts of good people,' he adds 'do not reject the abſolute predeſtination and decrees of 'God, nor ever did, ſimply conſidered, or juſtly conſidered. 'What our hearts revolt at, is the attributing ſuch decrees to God, 'as are contrary to his nature. GOD IS LOVE. Attribute no de-'crees to God but thoſe of infinite love,—and they will ſet ea-'ſy on our minds.'† The Doctor is here trying to prove the future happineſs of all men from the nature of God. 'As the 'nature of God is love, he will bring us all, every human ſoul '*in due time*, to ſee and approve of his infinite wiſdom and 'love, in all his works.'‡ The boundleſs love of God, he thinks, forms an argument that makes the ſalvation of all men certain. And the final damnation of ſome part of mankind he conſiders to be contrary to the divine nature. 'I cannot ſee,' he ſays, 'that 'the moſt holy God can derive any glory to himſelf, or commu-'nicate any good to the intelligent ſyſtem, from the eternal, per-'ſonal damnation of any guilty ſinner of the human kind; or that 'ſuch a thing can be without manifeſt oppoſition to the bleſſed 'nature of God, who is infinite love.'§ He often ſpeaks in this poſitive manner, ſhowing how contrary it is, to the bleſſed nature of God that even one human creature ſhould finally periſh. His meaning is therefore plain—'Attribute no decrees to God but thoſe of 'infinte love'—'Charge him with no decrees that are contrary 'to his nature,' none but ſuch as include the eternal happineſs of all men, 'and they will ſet eaſy on our minds—, & they will all ap-'pear beautiful,' as he further ſays. What our hearts revolt at,' juſt-'ly revolt at is the attributing ſuch decrees to God as are contrary to his nature,' as include the endleſs miſery of part of mankind.

The counſels and decrees of God are to be viewed in the ſame light as his events of providence, *vice verſa*. The evnts of providence are the fruits and fulfilment of his holy counſels. But, according

* P. 80 † P. 221. ‡ P. 229 § P. 319.

according to the Doctor's rule, we muſt know that God has decreed our eternal happineſs, before we are bound to ſubmit to his authority. This gives the plain language of the Doctor's reaſoning. When men can aſcertain that the decrees of God do 'fully 'ſecure their certain happineſs after death,' then they will 'ſet 'eaſy' on their minds; but if they cannot aſcertain this, their hearts and lives may juſtly 'revolt at' his decrees. And when men can ſee the events of divine providence all tending to this great end, viz. their own happineſs in the next world, then theſe events of providence will 'appear beautiful.' But if men do not ſee things in this light, they have a right to riſe up and oppoſe divine providence. Which opens the way to juſtify all the murmuring and rebellion againſt God, that ever took place. The Iſraelites, on their march from Egypt to Canaan, when at the Red Sea, and when they ſaid to Moſes, 'Becauſe there were no 'graves in Egypt, haſt thou taken us away to die in the wilder-'neſs?'* did not know that this event of providence, ſo myſterious to them, was ſuited to 'ſecure their certain happineſs after 'death.' Therefore with their hearts and mouths they 'revolted at' it.

The fixed decrees or eternal counſels of the Moſt High, as far as they are made known, are to be conſidered in the ſame light as his written word. This comes to us clothed with infinite authority. 'Wherefore the law,' and not excepting its curſes 'is 'holy, and juſt and good.'† This law is for the higheſt good of the univerſe. In like manner, the purpoſes and decrees of Jehovah are for the beſt good of the intelligent ſyſtem. As we ought to love the law of God, eſteeming it better than thouſands of gold and ſilver, ſo we ought to love his decrees, providence, and government. Whether we can ſee the curſes of the law ſet aſide, as to ourſelves in particular, or not, ſtill this does not make it leſs amiable. And whether we can ſee the decrees and providence of God to be for us or againſt us, ſtill we ought to rejoice that the LORD reigneth. Even that God which can do us no injuſtice, but does all things well. The very act of repentance, and there is no repentance without it, implies ſubmiſſion and love to the law of God, although we may ſee no other than all its curſes ſtanding againſt us. Repentance is an hearty ſubmiſſion of the ſinner to God, his law, decrees, and government; but not that God yields the point up to the ſinner. As the blame of the original apoſtacy, and of our continuing in rebellion againſt our holy Sovereign, muſt be attributed entirely to man; ſo it is evident that man, in the act of true repentance, muſt and does return back to the

* Exod. 14. 11. † Rom. 7. 12.

the exact point from whence he fell. But, in the inſtant of the original apoſtacy, Adam could ſee nothing before him but endleſs death. Therefore, every ſinner when returning back to his God, or in the moment of repentance, can ſee nothing before him but endleſs death. He, however, cordially approves of the death, and of every thing contained in the law. It is not neceſſary for us to be reconciled to endleſs death, in itſelf conſidered, this is impoſſible. But a cordial approbation of the whole law, that endleſs death is right and fitting, what we juſtly deſerve, is implied in repentance.

Again, the goſpel, although it pronounces 'everlaſting deſtruction'* on the unbeliever, ought to be received with gladneſs of heart, as 'good tidings of great joy.' And becauſe it offers ſalvation to every creature, and actually ſecures the ſalvation of every penitent believer. Were the deſtruction or death to be left out of the goſpel, were all without diſtinction to be made happy in the next world, and it would, as Dr. H. does throughout his book, give countenance to all poſſible wickedneſs. Which could not be glad tidings to ſuch as love righteouſneſs and hate iniquity.

Thus the law and the goſpel bring all poſſible good to the penitent believer; exhibiting, alſo, the greateſt motive before infidels, to perſuade them to believe. But they bring, at the ſame time, all poſſible evil to the unbeliever, conſidering him as ſuch. The ſame may be ſaid of the decrees and government of God. The law and the goſpel, in the moſt deſirable ſenſe, are in favour of the believer; ſo are all the decrees, and counſels of heaven. The law and the goſpel, in the moſt alarming ſenſe, are againſt the unbeliever, as ſuch; ſo are all the decrees and counſels of heaven. From the law and the goſpel the believer has every thing to hope; from the law and the goſpel the unbeliever has every thing to fear. So from the decrees of God the believer has every thing to hope, while, from the ſame ſource, the unbeliever has every thing to fear. At the ſame time, the law, and the goſpel, and the decrees, and the providence, and the government of God, all harmoniouſly unite, to alarm, and to invite ſinners to become true believers.

Furthermore, the law and the goſpel preſent to our view, moſt clearly, the perfect freedom of men. 'Thus ſaith the LORD, Behold, I ſet before you the way of life, and the way of death.'†—'Chooſe you this day whom you will ſerve.'‡ The decrees of God, alſo, teach the ſame perfect freedom among men. Inſtead of interfering with, or reſtraining, the entire freedom of men, the decrees

* Theſ. 1. 9. † Jerem. 21. 8. ‡ Joſh. 26. 15.

decrees of God do indeed eſtabliſh and ſecure it. Some ſuppoſe, becauſe his decrees are unalterable, and becauſe his government is univerſal, men are no longer free. They might as well ſay, becauſe his law binds all our thoughts, words, and actions, and becauſe it is unalterable, it is not good. They might as well ſay, becauſe the terms of the goſpel are fixed, and men muſt neceſſarily come up to an exact point, to obtain ſalvation, therefore the terms of the goſpel are hard. Certainly if the law, the goſpel, the decrees, and the providence of God, give men liberty to do, and to enjoy all the good they are capable; to be as holy and happy as God himſelf, according to their nature; they have the only thing which can properly be called liberty, and they have it in the higheſt ſenſe. But the fact is, men wiſh for a different kind of liberty. They wiſh for liberty to commit ſin, and not be called to an account.

As Dr. H. has not ſteadily adhered to theſe rules, but has often contradicted them, he cannot be reckoned among the friends of calviniſm. He appears to have introduced the doctrines of the divine decrees, predeſtination, election, &c. ſo as to have opportunity to miſrepreſent them; render them highly diſguſtful, even frightful and horrid to his readers; unleſs they can be made ſubſervient to his own ſcheme, the ſalvation of all men.

7. Dr. H. muſt now find himſelf in a ſad dilemma. For either firſt, he muſt grant that his wide door, which would admit all men in, in the next world, is ſhut, while they continue in this world; and 'ſatan left to ſhare the prize.' Or, ſecondly, he muſt withdraw his formidable objection againſt the ſimitarians, and grant that their foundation of faith is according to the goſpel. He muſt grant the righteouſneſs of Chriſt alone to be an unfailing foundation for us to build our faith and hope upon. That all of us are under infinite obligation to come unto Chriſt, believing him to be the rock of eternal ſalvation; although it be a ſecret to us whether we are elected to eternal ſalvation, or not. He muſt acknowledge that we can have no evidence whatever of our ſafe and happy ſtate after death, any further than we find our hearts and lives conformed to the goſpel. And, he muſt acknowledge that he was led into the ſcheme of univerſaliſm through miſtaken notions. 'After all reſearches,'* that he had not underſtood one of 'the firſt principles of the oracles of God,'† even the proper warrant and ground to believe to life eternal.

I am, &c.

LETTER

* P. 12. † Heb. 5. 12.

LETTER III.

Dr. H. holds that all who are impenitent at death are then regenerated; this compared to his rule of faith, and to other things in his Scheme; alſo the abſurd conſequences of this ſentiment.

My dear Friend,

AS a neceſſary article in his plan, Dr. Huntington ſuppoſes, all who remain impenitent until death, then to have, at this eventful moment, regeneration, repentance, faith, and all the chriſtian graces; ſo as to complete them for heaven. Reference was had to this in the foregoing letters. To ſee its ſeveral connections and conſequences, as well as make a juſt compariſon, this ſentiment will now be particularly conſidered.

The Reader is here informed, the Doctor makes no eſſential difference between the believer and unbeliever, as to a preparation for death; in his view, both theſe characters are alike prepared. 'Much is ſaid,' ſays he, 'about being fit to die. There is one 'fitneſs and but one, and that is by no means perſonal; but in 'the perfect character of a covenant head, a vicar, or Surety, 'in the full atonement, and all perfect worthineſs of Jeſus. 'Whatever difference progreſſive grace may make between man-'kind in this life (and great is the bleſſing of all thoſe who are 'elected to ſpecial attainments of grace in this world) yet every 'one without diſtinction, is left utterly unfit for heaven, ſo long 'as the ſoul is in the body, an awful unclean thing. No un-'clean thing ſhall enter into that world. On the ſeparation 'of 'ſoul and body' and not before, is any ſoul in its own qualifi-'cations and temper fit; but in a relative view, all, for whom 'Chriſt died, are ſo. Their garments are all alike waſhed and 'made white in the blood of the Lamb.'*—The notion of ſome 'fitneſs in a ſinner for heaven, whether a penitent or an impeni-'tent ſinner, is utterly repugnant to the whole word of God. It 'is built wholly on a legal ſpirit, and on our attachment to our 'old covenant of works. It wars againſt every evangelical mo-'tive of comfort in our ſouls, and obedience in our lives. It 'ſtands in oppoſition to an entire dependence on God in Chriſt, 'and to every moral virtue.'†—Thus, in the ſtrongeſt terms the Doctor exclaims againſt what is called a preparation for death. But Chriſt commands us, 'Be ye alſo ready: for in ſuch an 'hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh. Matt. XXIV. '44. So in Deut. XXXII. 29. O that they were wiſe, that they

* P. 193. † P. 194, 195.

they underſtood this, that they would conſider their latter end!

Had Dr. H. ſhown in what particular things both 'the penitent 'and impenitent are utterly unfit for heaven,' he would then have given ſome light on the ſubject. But lumping things together, as he here does, is an unpardonable fault. Rejecting, every kind of diſtinction, and making theſe two characters agree in all reſpects, is ſuited to miſlead 'the unlearned and unſtable, 'that they might wreſt the ſcriptures, unto their own deſtruction.' In point of merit, or in the view of law and juſtice only, there is no difference between the believer and unbeliever. On this ground, the latter is as fit for heaven as the former. So, 'no unclean thing ſhall ever enter into heaven; and believers have a great ſhare of moral uncleanneſs, while in the body. But does this argue no difference of any kind between him who has prevailing love to God, and him who ſays in his heart, *No God*? Does this argue no difference between that faithful ſervant who is watching and waiting the coming of his LORD, longing to depart and be with Chriſt; and that evil ſervant who begins to ſmite his fellow ſervants, and to eat and drink with the drunken? Again, is a humble dependence on the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, for pardon and acceptance with God; is this 'build-'ing wholly on a legal ſpirit, and on our attachment to our old 'covenant of works?' if ſo, where is 'the great bleſſing,' Dr. H. juſt mentioned, 'of all thoſe who are elected to ſpecial at-'tainments of grace in this world?'

But we here aſcertain the Doctor's ſentiment 'on the ſepara-'tion,' when men die, 'and not before, is any ſoul in its own 'temper fit to die, or fit for heaven. 'But in a relative view, 'all for whom Chriſt died are ſo.' That is in a relative view, all mankind are equally fit to meet death, and be taken to heaven. 'Their garments are all alike waſhed and made white in the blood 'of the Lamb.' The relation they all bear to Chriſt, places them all on equal footing. And the great work of ſanctification, to fit the mind for heaven, is done for every one of us at death. 'A ſpecial work of Chriſt,' he ſays, 'there certainly muſt be in 'death; or never one of the mere human kind can get to heaven.' —'The ſame infinite mercy, power, and faithfulneſs, which 'can then ſeperate one ſoul from all its unfitneſs for heaven, can 'another. Chriſt does but a ſmall part 'of his glorious work on 'any ſoul in this life. He graciouſly begins earlier with ſome 'than others; but he finiſhes with all alike, even at death.—'Sin 'and its attendants ſhall vex and diſtreſs the wicked as long as 'they live—It ſhall even drive them to death, to the king of ter-

rors;

'rors; but no further.'*—Speaking of Judas, our author ſays, 'Every man is a ſon of perdition until new born: damned until 'regenerated. Judas was a notable ſon of perdition, until his 'death;—even until ſoul and body were ſeparated; until then 'a ſon of perdition in an extraordinary degree.' Paul was ſo in 'a woful meaſure until he died, a wretched man with a body of 'death. Every man is ſo, in a ſad degree, until the union of ſoul and body is diſſolved.'† The Doctor goes on here, ſo in other places, to ſhow us that all men, as well as Judas and Paul are regenerated at the diſſolution of ſoul and body. Paul, he ſuppoſes, was *comparatively* or *negatively* regenerated in his early days. But for ſome cauſe, which he has not expreſsly given, he ſuppoſes Paul to need a greater degree of ſanctifying grace, when he is *poſitively* regenerated, at death, than Judas ſtood in need of, at the ſame awful moment.

The ſentiment we are now upon, the Doctor conſiders as highly important in his ſcheme. And truly it is a turning point with him. If it cannot be ſhown from ſcripture, that all impenitent men are renewed and ſanctified at death, his ſcheme wholly fails. We might, therefore, have expected he would, in a very particular manner, have attempted to prove this point. He has often brought it into view, often uſed words, that clearly imply it, and evidently places great dependence upon it. But has uſed no arguments directly and eſpecially in proof of it. The arguments and places of Scripture he uſes, are general ones, to prove all men will be ſaved. He firſt attempts to prove all will be ſaved, and then ſeems to take for granted, all will be fitted for heaven when they die. Whereas, if this be a ſcripture doctrine, it muſt be clearly and diſtinctly revealed. And might be eaſily ſhown to be contained in the bible; that is, ſomething directly to the point. Becauſe it is a point of the firſt importance to be ſettled. The Doctor often *aſſerts* things directly to the point, but *aſſertions* are no arguments. His treating things in this looſe manner, gives ground of ſuſpicion, to ſay the leaſt, that he could find nothing directly to his purpoſe. And that there is nothing in the bible which looks that way; that is, to prove directly that all are made holy and fitted for heaven when they die. We ſhall, notwithſtanding, attend to ſome of his arguments, at this time; to others again, in following letters.

'Repentance,' he ſays 'is a free, ſovereign gift of God in Chriſt. 'And Jeſus is exalted to grant this grace, juſt as much as the re-'miſſion of ſins, in conſequence of it. 'He gives the for-'mer, only as the neceſſary channel, or medium by which par-'don

* P. 203, 204. † 199.

'don and ſalvation can come to the ſoul. The gift of this grace '(repentance) is juſt as much within his commiſſion, as *mediator* 'and *ſaviour* of the world, ſaviour of all men, as is the beſtow-'ment of pardon and heaven. 'Him hath God exalted, with "his right hand, to be a prince and a ſaviour, for to give re-"pentance to Iſrael, (all are ſo, in union with Chriſt by human "nature, and by covenant) and forgiveneſs of ſins.'* The firſt part of this argument is founded on this, 'Chriſt is the ſaviour 'of the world, and the ſaviour of all men.' The laſt part which is taking in the whole, reſts on this, All mankind are God's covenant Iſrael: 'All are ſo, in union with Chriſt, by human na-'ture, and by covenant.' We ſhall now proceed to examine each of theſe by itſelf.

Chriſt is the ſaviour of the world.—The term, *world*, is uſed in a great variety of meanings in common language; and is never diſtinctly underſtood, unleſs it be from other words, uſed in connection with it. We likewiſe read in the ſacred volume, 'Behold, the world is gone out after him.'† That is a vaſt multitude of people went out to meet Jeſus, when he was riding into Jeruſalem. Which was, however, a very ſmall part of the whole world.—'Love not the world, neither the things that are 'in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father 'is not in him.'‡ This explains 'the world' to mean its empty pleaſures, which worldly men ſo eagerly purſue.—'The Spirit 'of truth: whom the world cannot receive.'§ Denoting the native oppoſition of the unbelieving world, who cannot, or will not love the truth.—'If the fall of them be the riches of the world, 'and the diminiſhing of them the riches of the Gentiles. If the 'caſting away of them be the reconciling of the world.'‖ The world here means the uncircumciſed nations, or the Gentiles in general; taken in oppoſition to the Jews. In each of the above texts, the term *world*, gives a different idea from the reſt. And, perhaps, thirty more inſtances of it might be found in the bible, uſed in the ſame manner. This argues that it was neceſſary for Dr. H. to have ſhown us, in what ſenſe Chriſt is the Saviour of the world. Before he had built an argument upon it, to prove that all men have repentance at death; he ought to have ſhown the preciſe meaning of the expreſſion, with its various relations and connection throughout the bible. Inſtead of this, he has taken it without any explanation. Or he has taken for granted, from his being ſtiled ſaviour of the world, that he will ſave all men with eternal ſalvation; conſequently, will bring all men to repentance.

* P. 127. † John 12. 19. ‡ 1 John 2. 15. § John 14. 17. ‖ Rom. 11. 12. 15.

We meet with the expreſſion, 'The ſaviour of the world,' twice in the new teſtament. Firſt in John's Goſpel, IV. 42. 'Now 'we believe, not becauſe of thy ſaying: for we have heard him 'ourſelves, and know that this is indeed the Chriſt, the ſaviour of 'the world.' The men of Samaria ſaid this to the woman, whom Jeſus converſed with at Jacob's well. Jeſus ſaid to this woman, 'Ye worſhip ye know not what: we know what we worſhip: for 'ſalvation is of the Jews.' The way of ſalvation through the Meſſiah, was then taught only among the Jews. The Samaritans, with all nations of the earth, were totally ignorant of this way; worſhiping they knew not what. But the expected Meſſiah, he, who was then come, was bringing ſalvation to the Samaritans, and to the Gentile world, as well as to the Jews. This was believed among the Samaritans. 'I know,' ſaid this woman, 'that Meſſias cometh 'which is called Chriſt: when he is come he will tell us all things.' In fulfilment of ancient prophecies, he was expected to come not only a ſaviour to the Jews, but a ſaviour to the Gentiles alſo. Therefore, when the men of Samaria, on that joyous occaſion, ſaid, 'This is indeed the Chriſt, the ſaviour of the world;' the undoubted meaning is, he is the ſaviour of the poor outcaſt Samaritans, Greeks and Barbarians, the uncircumciſed world in general, as well as the ſaviour of the Jews. And the way of ſalvation is now about to be taught in the heathen world, as well as in the land of Judea. So that it can no more be ſaid, ſalvation is only of the Jews. But, from that ſaying of Chriſt, 'Salvation is of the Jews,' or the way of ſalvation is taught among them, who would think of raiſing an argument from it, to prove that all the Jews will be ſaved? This, however, as fully proves it as the other expreſſion, 'Chriſt, the 'ſaviour of the world,' proves that all the world will be ſaved. The former contains every thing intereſting to the Jews, as to their eternal ſalvation, which the latter does, as to the eternal ſalvation of the world, or Gentiles in general. For the former is explicative of the latter, & the latter is juſt parallel with the former. Accordingly, the apoſtle ſays, We preach Chriſt crucified, unto the Jews a ſtumbling-block, and unto the Greeks fooliſhneſs. But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Chriſt the power of God, and the wiſdom of God.'*

We again meet with the above expreſſion, in John's firſt Epiſtle, IV. 14. 'We have ſeen and do teſtify, that the Father hath 'ſent the Son to be the ſaviour of the world.' There being no words ſtanding in a near connection with theſe, to help us to their diſtinct meaning, we muſt have recourſe to other places in the bible.

* 1. Cor. 1. 23, 24.

ble. And as this expression is not again to be found, and as *the world* often means the Gentiles in general, it is natural to receive it in the same light as above. Yea, we cannot see how it can be explained in any other light. The expression being found only twice in the sacred book, and the sense given in one of the places only, from its connection, this must needs decide the sense of both.

Besides, as it is plainly and repeatedly asserted in revelation, that part of mankind, 'according to their deeds,' will be made miserable to eternity, the phrase, 'the saviour of the world,' cannot, without manifest violence to the truth, favour the notion of the salvation of all men. Viewing of it consistently with its various relations, and with the tenor of scripture, its obvious meaning is, Christ has opened a glorious way of salvation to all men. The consequence is, 'as many as were ordained to eternal life, 'believed.' 'The election hath obtained it, and the rest were 'blinded.'*

The Doctor says again, *Christ is the saviour of all men.* He ought to have said, God is the saviour of all men; as we shall presently see.—God may justly be stiled the saviour of all men, and this be far from implying that he will grant eternal salvation to all men. The title of *saviour* is sometimes given to men. As may be seen in Neh. IX. 27, and Obad. 21. God gave to Israel in the time of their judges, *deliverers*, or *saviours;* who saved them, or delivered them out the hand of their enemies. Pharaoh called Joseph's name Zaphnathpaaneah; in the Egyptian tongue, this is, *saviour of the world.* So if God delivers, preserves, provides for, or saves all men, while in time; he may very fitly be called the saviour of all men.

But let us see the whole of the sentence, to which Dr. H. has reference. 1 Tim. IV. 10. 'For therefore we both labour, 'and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is 'the saviour of all men, specially of those that believe.' As there are so many expressions of the apostle's, and of Christ which assert the eternal misery of some of mankind, this must be limited to time only, agreeably to its natural import. 'For there-'fore we, the ministers of Christ, both labour under, and suffer 'reproach, because we trust in the living God. When we have 'all reason to trust in him, who is the preserver and disposer of all 'men, specially of those that believe.' This distinction in favour of believers, or between believers and unbelievers, can no way be interpreted but according to the words of Abraham, to the rich man in hell: 'Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime 'receivedst

* Acts 13. 48 and Rom. 11. 7.

'recievedſt thy good things, and likewiſe Lazarus evil things; 'but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented.'* From the kind preſerver of men, even the enemies of the croſs, in their life-time, have their good things. When they depart this life, for their abuſes of theſe good things, 'in hell they lift up their eyes 'being in torments.' And how can God be ſtiled the ſaviour of all men, ſpecially of thoſe that believe; when, in this world, the righteous have their evil things, and the wicked their good things; unleſs, in the world to come, the former be comforted and the latter tormented?

To explain things in that looſe manner Dr. H. does, and God may as well be called *the deſtroyer of all men.* Thus in the following words—'The earth and all the inhabitants thereof are 'diſſolved.'† 'All nations compaſſed me about: but in the name 'of the LORD will I deſtroy them.‡ 'Thus ſaith the LORD God 'of Iſrael unto me, take the wine cup of this fury at my hand, 'and cauſe all the nations, to whom I ſend thee, to drink it. And 'all the kingdoms of the world, which are upon the face of the 'earth; and the king of Sheſhach ſhall drink after them. Thus 'ſaith the LORD of hoſts, drink ye, and be drunken, and ſpue, 'and fall, and riſe no more. 'The LORD ſhall roar from on high; 'he ſhall give a ſhout, as they that tread the grapes, againſt all the 'inhabitants of the earth. A noiſe ſhall come even to the ends 'of the earth: for the LORD hath a controverſy with the nations; 'he will plead with all fleſh; he will give them that are wicked 'to the ſword.§ 'When the wicked ſpring as the graſs, and 'when all the workers of iniquity do flouriſh; it is that they ſhall 'be deſtroyed forever.‖ In Dr. H's looſe way of arguing, by overlooking the true ſenſe of words, God would here ſeem to be the *deſtroyer*, 'of all nations, of the ends of the earth, of all the 'kingdoms of the world, of all the inhabitants of the earth, and of 'all fleſh.'—'And when all the workers of iniquity do flouriſh; 'it is that they ſhall be deſtroyed forever.' In his looſe way of arguing, or rather perverting, all the human race, without exception, are of this character, *workers of iniquity.* For as the apoſtle ſays, 'they are all gone out of the way, they are together 'become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not 'one.' All therefore, in Dr. H's perverſe way of ſpeaking, are workers of iniquity, and to be deſtroyed forever. Thus, has he ſet the example to make God the *deſtroyer* of all men, as well as the ſaviour of all.

Inſpiration, however, has ſolemnly cautioned us to make a difference between the precious and the vile. Such as will not turn

* Luke 16. 25. † Pſal. 75 3. ‡ Pſal. 118. 10 § Jerem. 25. 15, 26—31 ‖ Pſal. 92 7.

turn from their iniquity, but perſevere in it till they die, and die in their own corruption; theſe will God deſtroy forever. But ſuch as turn from their evil ways, or the righteous, he will guide them with his counſel, and afterward receive them to glory.—We now come to the laſt part of the Doctor's argument.

All mankind are in union with Chriſt, by human nature, and by covenant.—This is here introduced, to be kept in mind while we examine the other parts of his ſcheme; which will give opportunity to ſee the amount of his notion of *union* of all men with Chriſt. Letter IX. Part I. is deſigned for this purpoſe.

Another argument Dr. H. uſes, to prove that all have repentance at death, if not before; is this: 'The prayer of Chriſt is 'efficacious. Him the Father heareth alway.' He here goes on to aſſert that Chriſt, while expiring on the croſs, prayed for the pardon and eternal life of Judas, Pilate, Herod, the chief prieſts, and all his crucifiers. Then adds, 'in this prayer which the Fa-'ther certainly heard, (as he does alway without a ſingle excep-,tion) Jeſus comprehended every ſinner in the world; for every 'ſin doth crucify the Son of God. By this, and his other ef-'fectual interceſſions, he aſſured the promiſed grace, to take 'hold of their hearts in his own time.'*

The Doctor reſts the whole on the prayer, Chriſt made in theſe words: 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what 'they do.'† It is here remarkable, Chriſt does not pray for their repentance; or his words do not expreſs it. Neither does this prayer give ground of proof, that they will one of them, who crucified him, ever have repentance. It gives ground to hope for the repentance of ſome of them, and many of them; but no ſolid proof. They might all of them never have repentance, and at the ſame time this prayer, for ought we can ſay, be literally anſwered; according to ſimilar examples in ſcripture. There are two kinds of forgiveneſs. One connects with, or includes repentance and eternal life; but the other does not. A notable inſtance of this latter kind of forgiveneſs we find in Numb. xiv. For Iſrael's aggravated rebellion, related in this chapter, God was juſt about to conſume the whole congregation, in a moment. Therefore Moſes cried unto the LORD, and in behalf of the redeemer, ſaying, 'Pardon, I beſeech thee, the iniquity of this 'people according unto the greatneſs of thy mercy, and as thou 'haſt forgiven this people, from Egypt even until now. And the 'LORD ſaid, I have pardoned according to thy word.' It is certain this pardon does not prove that theſe rebels had repentance, or ever will have. Many of them died with the ſame rebellious hearts,

* P. 128. † Luke 23. 34.

hearts, and were made miſerable forever. But God ſo far pardoned them, as not to ſmite them with the peſtilence, or diſinherit them. He ſo far pardoned them, as not to make of them, at that moment, a monument of divine vengeance. He ſo far pardoned them, as to give them a further day of grace. A very intereſting pardon indeed. So, in anſwer to the prayer of his dear Son, God pardoned all thoſe who imbrued their hands in his blood; excepting Judas who was then beyond the reach of prayer. God ſtayed his juſtice, the cup of his fury was not poured upon them, as it often had been on others, in caſes far leſs provoking. And theſe crucifiers, and murderers of the Son of God, not only had their lives ſpared, but a moſt eminent day of ſalvation allotted them. Which was a very intereſting pardon. Hence, we may allow Chriſt's prayer to have included all his crucifiers, who were then alive: and that it was literally anſwered; and this be no kind of proof, in itſelf, that they all had or will have repentance unto ſalvation. We are warranted to ſay this from the above example in Numb. xiv, and many others that might be cited.

The plea Chriſt uſes in this prayer, will alſo help to underſtand it. 'Father, forgive them: for they know not what they do.' Their ignorance, or becauſe the great body of them, at leaſt, knew not what they did, is the burden of the plea, why they ſhould be forgiven. This implies, that had they known Chriſt to be the Son of God, no ſuch plea could have been made in their favour. Or ſhould they, after full conviction on their minds that he is the true Meſſiah, juſtify themſelves for the horrid deed of putting him to death, they would then be guilty of that wilful ſin, for which 'there remaineth no more ſacrifice.' The apoſtle John ſays, referring to the ſame ſin, 'There is a ſin unto death: I do 'not ſay that he,' a chriſtian brother, 'ſhall pray for it.' The apoſtle Paul ſays to Timothy, 'I obtained mercy, becauſe I did 'it ignorantly in unbelief.' Implying that had he gone on with his eyes open, to waſte and deſtroy the church of God, he muſt have been beyond the reach of divine mercy. Becauſe he committed thoſe enormous deeds, in a ſtate of blindneſs or unbelief, he therefore obtained mercy. Theſe things ſtrongly argue, that the ſame deeds againſt Chriſt or his people, done with full conviction and *knowledge of the truth*, amount to blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt. For which there is no forgiveneſs, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. It will hereafter be ſhown that ſome of the Jews did commit this ſin, for which they were never forgiven. Therefore, this prayer of Chriſt, inſtead of aſſuring the promiſed grace to take hold of every ſinner in the

world,

world, immediately brings into view the unpardonable ſin: Which gives a concluſive argument for the endleſs miſery of ſome of mankind.

Again, John xvii. 9. determines the point we are now upon: 'I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which 'thou haſt given me; for they are thine.' On which we remark. 1. Chriſt here gives an example, ſhowing how he ever lives to intercede for thoſe, *given* to him by the Father. 2. He makes two claſſes of men. 'I pray for them.' The *them* make one claſs. 'I pray not for the world.' *The world* is another claſs, diſtinct from the firſt. Chriſt repeats the diſtinction: 'but for them which 'thou haſt given me.' *Not for the world, but for them thou haſt given me:* which is a double diſtinction, and as plain as words can be. See alſo v. 6. preceding. 'The men which thou 'gaveſt me out of the world.' If theſe men are taken out from others, others are ſtill left, which makes two claſſes. To deny there are here two diſtinct claſſes, is throwing things into ſuch confuſion, as to leave no ground of proof that any will be ſaved. 3. For one of theſe claſſes of men Chriſt prays, and for the other he does not. 4. He explains who theſe are among men, for whom he prays. 'Neither pray I for theſe alone, (*theſe*, who were then 'in being) but for them alſo who ſhall believe on me through their 'word.' v. 20. And, in another place, for all whom the Father has given him he promiſes, that his grace ſhall cauſe them to come to him, or believe in him. 5. He explains who theſe are, he does not pray for. And they are *the world;* ſuch as hate him. 'If 'the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you.'* That is, they live and die with this character. 6. The burden of Chriſt's prayer, for this claſs he prays for, is their eternal life. But as he does not pray for the other claſs, ſo he does not pray for their eternal life.

From which it is clear, that part of our fallen race is given to Chriſt, in a diſtinct ſenſe from the world in general. All are given to him in this ſenſe, that he might do with them according to his will. But a certain part is given to him, that he might give to them eternal life. It is alſo clear, there is a ſelect number for whom Chriſt prays, in a diſtinct ſenſe from what he does for the world in general. He prays for all, that juſtice might be ſuſpended; whenever this is done for them. But thoſe given to him by the Father, that he might give to them eternal life, he prays for their repentance and ſanctification. On the contrary, thoſe not given to him in this diſtinct ſenſe, he does not pray for their repentance and ſanctification. Of courſe, theſe never will have repentance.

Univerſaliſts

* John 15. 18.

Univerſaliſts would evade the force of this, by ſaying, all are given to Chriſt, in ſuch manner as he is engaged to give to them eternal life. But this is only taking for granted, what lies on them to prove. They again urge John xvii. 21, 23. 'As thou, Father, 'art in me, and I in thee, that they (his diſciples) alſo may be one 'in us: that the world *may believe* that thou haſt ſent me. I in 'them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; 'and that the world *may know* that thou haſt ſent me:' Pretending Chriſt here prays that the whole world might know and believe in him, in ſuch manner as to be ſaved.* To anſwer this, there are two kinds of belief, and two kinds of knowledge. Wicked men may believe as devils do, and they may know the Father has ſent the Son; and this only enhance their torment in hell. This point is further diſcuſſed in Let. III, IV. Part IV.

How Dr. H. could advance this ſentiment directly againſt the words of Chriſt. is left with his advocates. Chriſt ſolemnly appeals to God the Father as witneſs, that he does not pray for the eternal life of ſome part of the human race. Which is declaring that his grace never will take hold of their hearts, to lead them to repentance. And unleſs this grace does take hold of their hearts, it is certain they *will not* come to Chriſt. But will die in their rebellion, and 'utterly periſh in their own cor-'ruption.'† 'His bones are full of the ſin of his youth, which 'ſhall lie down with him in the duſt.'‡ In the ſame manner will they riſe at the laſt day. And at the day of Judgment two claſſes of men will ſtand before their Judge. Thoſe on *the left hand* will ſhow decided marks of impenitence, by attempting to juſtify themſelves. As in Matt. xxvi. 44. 'Lord, when ſaw 'we thee an hungred, or athirſt, or a ſtranger, or naked, or ſick, 'or in priſon, and did not miniſter unto thee?' Exactly the ſame ſelf-juſtification men plead in this world. But what can give ſtronger evidence of impenitence? Again, vs 24, 25. 'Lord, I 'knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou haſt 'not ſown, and gathering where thou haſt not ſtrawed: And I 'was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth: lo, there 'thou haſt that is thine.' In this ſhocking manner therefore, will the wicked condemn themſelves, at that day, out of their own mouth. How different is this from the language of that claſs on the *right hand* of the Judge. See v. 37. 'When ſaw 'we thee an hungred, and fed thee? or thirſty and gave thee 'drink?' &c. Frankly confeſſing they have done nothing for their dear Lord, as they ought to have done.

Dr.

* See Mr. Winchester's Dialogues, p. 122, 123. † 2 Pet. 2. 12. ‡ Job 20. 11.

Dr. H. attempts to eſcape theſe awful truths, by ſaying, 'At 'the great and ſolemn day,' the day of judgment, 'characters 'ſhall be ſeparated one from another, as a ſhepherd divideth the 'ſheep from the goats.' 'The character of ſinners was always 'at God's left hand, and always will be.' 'The character is of-'ten named, and the perſon omitted.'* It is a common thing with the Doctor, and eſſential in his ſcheme, that characters, ſeparated from perſons, will ariſe at the judgment day, and be judged: the righteous characters welcomed to heaven, and the wicked characters ſent to hell. But characters, ſeparated from perſons, can be nothing more than ſins, ſeparated from ſinners; or virtues, ſeparated from the virtuous. This appears to be the Doctor's idea. He, however, evidently confounds himſelf. 'Our bones,' ſays he, 'will be full of the ſin of our youth, which 'will be buried together with us in the duſt; but will not ariſe 'with us, except in the holy voice of law: And in this ſenſe all 'mankind ſhall awake to ſhame and everlaſting contempt, and 'abide ſo forever; but in goſpel language and *certain effect*, 'all ſhall awake to everlaſting life.'† Their perſons will awake to everlaſting life, but their ſins to everlaſting contempt. That this is his meaning, will yet more fully appear. Their ſins, therefore, awake 'in the holy voice of law.' Their ſins ariſe at the day of judgment, and ſtand before the Judge; and, 'in the 'holy voice of law,' make that plea of ſelf-juſtification, as above ſtated. Even *in the holy voice of law* ſay unto the Judge, 'I 'knew thee that thou art an hard man!' &c. Thus Dr. H. to complete his ſcheme, is conſtrained to make the holy voice of law, and ſin, both ſpeak the ſame language! This appears to be the ſole tendency of his book, to cry up ſin, and to trample on the holy law.

Though Dr. H. would reduce to nothing, the awful tranſactions of the great day of judgment, by running them into myſtick wildneſs; ſtill we have ſtriking facts of the ſame nature, every day before our eyes. 'I knew thee that thou art an hard man, 'reaping where thou haſt not ſown, and gathering where thou 'haſt not ſtrawed.' It is common for ſinners to complain, that God has not given them an heart, to fear and love him: meaning, at the ſame time, to exculpate themſelves, and caſt the blame on God. Not thinking how they 'do always reſiſt the Holy 'Ghoſt.'‡

Before we proceed to the principal things intended, we muſt notice, Dr. H. holds that repentance and regeneration take place, in the hearts of ſinners, while ſoul and body are one. Or ſome

* P. 66, 167, 168. † P. 206. ‡ Acts 6. 51.

things in his book certainly imply this. Although he has fixed upon the time at the parting moment; ſtill he muſt grant it to be while ſoul and body conſtitute one diſtinct agent. Elſe he muſt aſſign a probationary ſtate and ſeaſon of grace in the next world; or, at leaſt, a ſort of purgatory, a half way place between earth and heaven. This he utterly rejects.* And this would make an entire alteration in his ſcheme. He alſo ſays, 'We are 'plainly taught in the word of God, that every ſoul goes imme-'diately after death, into an eternal fixed ſtate; which never 'more admits of an alteration, but in progreſſive degree.'† If the ſoul goes *immediately* after death, into this ſtate, then certainly the great work, he tells of, muſt be done, while ſoul and body are united. As another concluſive evidence of this, he holds that every one will receive, in the next world, according to the things done in his body.‡

At length, my Friend, we are ready to attend to the principal object of this Letter. Which is to compare this ſentiment of the Doctor's, that all impenitent ſinners are regenerated at death, with his rule of faith, and other things in his book; alſo, to ſee the abſurd conſequences of this ſentiment. And

1. His rule of faith is, We have no warrant to ſeek eternal life by Chriſt, unleſs we firſt know we are elected to it. And, as he has made out by his reaſoning, We have no goſpel-warrant to exhort men to embrace any one ſpiritual bleſſing, till we know they are elected to this bleſſing. Great is the bleſſing, he ſays, of all who are elected to ſpiritual attainments of grace in early life. But he knows not that all men are thus elected. Neither does he pretend to know that any one man, now impenitent, is elected to repentance before his dying moment. It is an eſtabliſhed point with him, that all are ordained to it, by God, when that ſerious event overtakes them. But the great majority of men, he ſays, are left, 'by the fixed decree of God, to live un-'der the damnable power of impenitence' all their days. Theſe things are fairly contained in his ſcheme, and not one of them to be ſpared; as has been ſhown, in this and the foregoing Letters. How is it poſſible, therefore, for him to preach repentance, declaring, Now is the accepted time, only to ſuch as are paſſing out of time into eternity!

He has fixed upon the period when all are to become true penitents, which is in the laſt inſtant of life; or the laſt thought while ſoul and body are one. 'The very moment before we ex-'pire,' ſays he, 'the beſt do juſtly cry out, O wretched men 'that we are, we have a body of death!—The ſame infinite mer-'cy,

* See in P. 205—207. † P. 204. ‡ P. 64, 234, 235.

'cy, power, and faithfulneſs, which can then ſeperate one ſoul 'from all its unfitneſs for heaven, can another.'*—This is the moment, the moment of death, and not before; when the great maſs of men are to have this great work of grace done in their hearts. The inſtant before death, he ſays, the bulk of mankind are wholly oppoſed to repentance; like 'the moſt abandoned ſai-'lor, having his head taken off with a cannon ball, with an hor-'rid oath in his mouth.'†—Now, when this 'moſt abandoned ſai-'lor's head is taken off with a cannn ball,' then can Dr. H. ſtand forth and exhort him to repentance, and not before. The reaſon is becauſe he does not know, this abandoned creature is elected to repentance before this. And if he exhorts ſinners to that which he does not know they are elected to, he exhorts them to make God a liar, in ſo doing; according to his own words.

Thus, the mighty, the boaſted claim Dr. H. aſſumes above all others, of preaching the goſpel to every creature, of 'pouring in 'this additional light,'‡ does indeed amount to this: He can flatter all impenitent ſinners to believe a lie, that they might be damned. In direct oppoſition to divine truth, and to the utmoſt hazard of looſing their ſouls forever, he can flatter them, that they will all become true penitents, in their laſt expiring moment.

2. Dr. H. cannot pray for the repentance and ſanctification of all men, to be effected by the grace of God immediately, unleſs he, at the ſame time, prays for the immediate death of all men. 'We pray,' ſays he, 'for the ſalvation of all men. This we 'ought not to do without a foundation in the word of God. If 'God has decided the point in his word, that many ſhall be damn-'ed eternally, in their own perſons, we have no warrant to pray as 'we do.'§ He ſays again, God has decided the point in his word, that many will remain impenitent till their death. Hence he has no warrant to pray, conſiſtently with his own plan, that all men might become ſincere penitents, before their death. Should he, however, pray for the immediate ſanctification of all men, this, in his ſcheme, would include a prayer for the immediate death of all men.

God commands us to pray for all men. He therefore deſigns to ſave all men. God ſays 'he will have all men to be ſaved, and 'to come unto the knowledge of the truth.'‖ Therefore, all men will be ſaved. For who can reſiſt the divine will? Theſe things form a very material argument among Univerſaliſts. But this argument proves too much, and of courſe proves nothing. It takes for granted, that God always brings about every thing he commands us to pray for. Which is not true. God commands us to pray

* P. 204. † P. 187. ‡ P. 13. § P. 169. ‖ 1 Tim. 2. 4.

pray for the life of our chief magistrate. But our chief magistrate dies. God commands us to pray for our daily bread. Could St. Paul argue from hence that he should never suffer hunger? Universalists seem to have forgotten one important article of prayer; for which Christ gave an example. 'Father, if it be possible, let 'this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou 'wilt.'* So that all our petitions are to be left with the divine will.—Again, the argument takes for granted that God always accomplishes whatever he will: making no distinction between his preceptive and his decretive will. God wills that his people, 'with 'well-doing, put to silence the ignorance of foolish men.'† He wills that his professed people, 'no longer should live the rest of 'their time in the flesh, to the lusts of men, but to the will of God.'‡ These things God wills and commands, but does not in all cases determine them. And he wills many things that would be, in themselves, well-pleasing to him; which he has not determined shall take place. Christ said of Jerusalem, 'how often would I 'have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth her brood under 'her wings, and ye would not!'§ God therefore wills that all men should come unto the knowledge of the truth, that they should lead quiet and peaceable lives, in all godliness and honesty, in the same sense as he will have all men to be saved.

But according to Dr. H's doctrine, we have no warrant to pray for all men, that they may lead quiet and peaceable lives, in all godliness and honesty, until they are just launching into eternity. Because, as he says, we do not know they are elected to these gracious exercises before that time. The Doctor says, 'If it is 'certain that the word of God, his justice and his glory, do ascertain the eternal, *personal* damnation of many; we ought to 'pray for that awful event, as explicitly as for any thing else.'‖ In another place he says, 'The word of God, his justice and glo'ry do ascertain, that the great majority of men do, and will live 'under the *damnable power* of impenitence, till their expiring 'moment.' Because he is certain of this, ought he to pray for this awful event, as explicitly as for any thing else? And because he is certain, as he pretends, that all men will have repentance at death, and not before, shall he pray for the immediate repent- of all men, and of course for the immediate death of all [illegible]? 'But how would it strike the minds of any congregation 'in the world,' he adds, 'to hear him that leads in prayer crying 'mightily to God, that many, or most of his fellow men, might 'be the miserable victims of his eternal vengeance *personally*, 'in hell to all eternity. Many men discern premises well, but 'do

* Matt. 26. 39. † 1 Pet. 2. 15 and ‡ 4. 2. § Luke 13. 34. ‖ P. 161.

' do not see the just consequence.'* With regard to one man, the Doctor has demonstrated this last expression.

3. The Doctor can administer no comfort to wretched sinners; nor, with hope of success, can he use any means with them; except it be in that moment he sees them passing into eternity. He says much about administering words of consolation to poor helpless sinners, And blames his opponents for their cruelty and hardness towards them. Speaking of malefactors, who are about to be led to the place of execution, there to end their lives with trembling and horror, he says, ' Why should ' we grudge them the mercy and pity of the Father of their spir- ' its?'† And many other things; intimating the cruelty of his opponents to these wretches, and how we ought to speak peace and comfort to their souls. But the Doctor can give them not the least solid comfort, he can speak not a word of peace to their souls before their expiring moment comes, or till they are indeed turned off the gallows. For he says these trembling wretches, and all others, who continue opposed to the grace of the gospel, ' can derive no comfort in their own souls from the blessed truth ' he maintains;'‡ meaning the blessed truth of universalism. And he pretends to have no evidence they are elected to hope in Jesus, and rejoice in God, until the last moment of their lives. But he must have evidence, according to his own scheme, that the moment is come, in which they are elected to this blessed enjoyment of God; else he has no right to exhort them to it. And if he should before this time exhort them to it, in his own words, he would exhort them ' to make God a liar, in so doing.'

Thus, the Doctor must acknowledge we have full warrant to exhort, to pray, to speak words of consolation, even in cases seemingly the most hopeless; when we are wholly ignorant of the secret counsels of God; when we know not whether those abandoned wretches ' will hear, or whether they will forbear.'§ He must also acknowledge that which is a very grievous eye-sore to him; that the ground and warrant we have to exhort sinners to embrace eternal life, is not because we are first certain they are elected to it; but because God, out of regard to Christ's atonement, ' hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom ' he will he hardeneth.'‖ These things, and others in connection, he must acknowledge; or find himself cut off from the use of all appointed means; even in cases most distressing and pitiful, which call aloud for the most pious exertions and compassionate feelings.

4. A

* P. 161. † P. 232. ‡ P. 232. § Ezek. 2. 5. ‖ Rom. 9. 18.

4. A threatening of temporal and untimely death, which is to be ſet aſide on condition of repentance, but certainly executed on condition of perſeverance in ſin; it is impoſſible ſuch a threatening, going on Dr. H's ground, ever ſhould be executed. Under the Jewiſh diſpenſation, ſo from Adam down to Chriſt, there were many divine threatenings of this nature: denouncing the temporal and untimely death of notorious ſinners, unleſs they repented. But if they repented they ſhould eſcape the threatening, or their lives ſhould ſtill be continued. Some crimes there were, as adultery, ſodomy, murder, &c. from which there was no deliverance. No deliverance, that is, when convicted in open court of any of theſe crimes; in this caſe the life of the criminal muſt go, as a ranſom for his crime. There were other crimes, however, or other caſes, from which they ſhould be reſcued, on condition of repentance, See in Ezek. xxxiii. 10—20. Amos v. 4—8, and many other places. Chriſt ſaid to the Jews, Luke xiii. 3. 'Except ye repent, ye ſhall all likewiſe periſh.' Imply-ing, if they did repent, they ſhould not in like manner periſh: ſhould not die an aggravated and untimely death, as thoſe Galileans did, 'whoſe blood Pilate had mingled with their ſacrifices.'

But if repentance takes place, as Dr. H. holds it does with every impenitent ſinner, in his laſt thought, or that which would be his laſt expiring thought without his repentance; this ſinner, having the offer and promiſe of life in conſequence of his repentance, would that inſtant be ſnatched from death, or have his life prolonged. No man can previouſly diſcern between life and death; or when the ſinner enters upon his laſt expiring groan or thought. Omniſcience however can. And one moment or one day is with the LORD as a thouſand years, and a thouſand years as one day. So one thought in the heart of man, as to his being pardoned, is ſubſtantially the ſame with God, as a ſeries of thoughts. Every promiſe of grace is made to the ſinner, to be beſtowed in him, and made ſure, at the inſtant of his turning to God. 'Before they call I will anſwer, and while they are yet ſpeak-'ing, I will hear.'* The inſtant the ſinner's heart feels humble, and he of courſe bows to God, the whole ſcene is reverſed. He then ſtands upon the ground of a juſtified perſon, all his paſt ſins being blotted out. 'At what *inſtant* I ſhall ſpeak concerning 'a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull 'down, and to deſtroy it: If that nation againſt whom I have 'pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil I 'thought to do unto them.'† This muſt apply to every individual, as well as to bodies of men, throughout the world. And it muſt

* Iſai. 65. 2. 4. † Jerem. 18. 7, 8.

muſt apply in the inſtant of death. We have an example to illuſtrate it, in Numb. xvi. The next day after the awful deſtruction of Korah and his company, in conſequence of the people's beginning again to murmur, wrath went out from the LORD, and the plague began among them. And no ſooner could Aaron take a cenſer, put fire therein from off the altar, put on incenſe, and run quickly into the midſt of the congregation, than there 'died 'of the plague, fourteen thouſand and ſeven hundred. And Aaron 'ſtood between the dead and the living, and the plague was ſtay-'ed.' Hundreds, if not thouſands, were then reſcued from death, as ſuddenly as one thought follows another. We have other examples of this ſort in the bible. But *a broken and contrite heart* is the ſacrifice or incenſe, on the part of the ſinner: That which lays hold of the infinite righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and reſcues the ſinner from death, in the ſame ſudden manner. How is it poſſible, therefore, for men to die with holineſs of heart, under the circumſtances above ſtated? If God lifts up his hand, if he is, this inſtant, about to give the ſtroke, ſo as to ſeparate ſoul and body aſunder, and the ſinner's heart yields to the terms, on which his life is promiſed to be prolonged, will not God ſtay his hand? Has he not promiſed to do it, and has he not illuſtrated his promiſe?

Granting therefore, as Dr. H. zealouſly pleads, all men do become *broken hearted* before ſoul and body are diſunited, and it is impoſſible this conditional threatening of death ever ſhould be executed. Dr. H's ſcheme therefore ſtands oppoſed to the providence of God. Yea, it is a moſt daring impeachment of divine providence. For more than four thouſand years did God threaten individuals, cities, nations, and kingdoms, with an untimely judicial death; giving them, at the ſame time, a ſpace of repentance; promiſing them, if they repented, that inſtant he would repent of the evil he thought to do unto them. The will of God, during this long ſeaſon, was publickly made known, throughout all the earth. As God has executed his threatenings of this kind again and again, and from one age to another his cup of indignation gone round among all nations; this ſentiment of Dr. H's does verily charge God with a violation of his promiſe, and that he has continued ſo long in the violation of it; cutting off thoſe who repent and turn at his reproof; deſtroying thoſe who become righteous, in the ſame manner as though they perſevered in unrighteouſneſs.

When men die an untimely death, by the ſword, famine, peſtilence, or any other way, and they have had no expreſs warning from

from God that they ſhould thus die, except they repented; in all ſuch caſes we cannot conclude, from the circumſtances of their death, whether they die with regenerated hearts or not. Men may alſo commit high treaſon, murder, &c. which crimes always merit death, without any conditions of pardon; but as they may improve their ſhort ſpace of repentance, relative to their future life, they may of courſe die heirs of eternal life. But if a murderer, who was under ſentence of death by the authority of man, ſhould have the offer of pardon on condition of repentance, and we ſhould afterwards hear that this murderer was executed; we ſhould naturally conclude that he died without repentance, that he went into eternity with murder in his heart. How much higher evidence have we when God threatens, and at the ſame time offers pardon: God who is infinitely faithful to his promiſes, who alone has the ſupreme power of life and death, who knows the hearts of men, and in this caſe deals with men, even in this world, according to the feelings of their hearts: how much higher evidence have we to conclude, therefore, that thoſe, who thus die by the execution of divine threatenings, have died without repentance? have gone into eternity with all their crimes ſtill in their hearts, which God has charged upon them? God has 'no 'pleaſure in the death,' the untimely death, 'of the wicked; 'but that the wicked would turn from his way and live.'* God in ancient time ſuited all his threatenings of this kind, in the beſt manner, to excite the wicked to turn to him and live—prolong their temporal lives. When the wicked, who were thus threatened, had turned to the LORD, although they were then upon the brink of eternity, as near to eternity as one thought is to another; there was the ſame reaſon they ſhould be called back from eternity, as in any period of their lives, their days ſhould ſtill be prolonged. Becauſe, when the wicked had turned to the LORD, his threatenings had then anſwered their natural import. This ſentiment, that all men do die with penitent hearts, muſt of courſe be given up. Which is giving up our author's whole ſcheme. But if we do not give it up, we muſt be found fighting againſt the cleareſt light of divine providence. A work ſo daring, as is ſcarcely to be expected from the moſt ſtupid and ignorant among the heathen.

5. All the awful threatenings, in the word of God, and which the Doctor calls awful threatenings of vengeance, of deſtruction, and of death, to the wicked; on his plan, theſe are converted into the moſt endearing promiſes of grace and ſalvation. Thus, when God threatened to deſtroy the inhabitants of the *old world*, by a deluge,

* Ezek. 33. 11.

deluge, and fixed the time of the expiration of an hundred and twenty years, this was, indeed, a moſt gracious promiſe, that then he would bring them all to repentance and take them to heaven. Alſo, in Dr. H's language, when that moſt ſurpriſing meſſage of deſtruction by fire and brimſtone, came to Sodom and Gomorrah, it was truly a general proclamation of grace and ſalvation. And when the angels ſet themſelves to execute 'the vengeance of eter-'nal fire' upon the inhabitants of theſe cities, their grand object muſt have been to deliver them from 'the damnable power of 'impenitence,' and take them all immediately to heaven; excepting righteous Lot and his two daughters. Divine truth informs us 'the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah was great', or it reached up to heaven. Dr. H. appears and ſays, heaven heard their blaſphemous cry, and ſent and took them all up to the everlaſting kingdom of glory! If the reader will pleaſe to turn to Gen. iii. 5. he will find language exactly correſponding with the Doctor's: 'And the ſerpent ſaid unto the woman, ye ſhall not ſurely die'.

6. In Dr. H's ſcheme, the day of death is eminently the day of grace, and the day of the out pouring of God's Spirit. When death comes, and ſo aſſuredly as death comes to every individual mortal, the ſanctifying operations of the Holy Ghoſt come with it. This is the doctrine of univerſaliſm. And when any noted ſeaſon in which death has been ſpread through the land, or through the world, there was then a ſpecial out-pouring of the divine ſpirit into the hearts of men. But we read in Gen. vi. 3. 'And the 'LORD ſaid, my ſpirit ſhall not always ſtrive with man, for that 'he alſo is fleſh: yet his days ſhall be an hundred and twenty years.' According to the tenour of *ſcripture*, God here warns the inhabitants of the *old world*, if they perſevered in their wickedneſs, at the expiration of an hundred and twenty years, his ſpirit ſhould no longer ſtrive with them; they ſhould be wholly given up to their own vile affections, and deſtroyed in their own corruption. Had Dr. H. been there, he would have ſaid, 'this was a moſt 'gracious promiſe; and although they perſevered and increaſed 'in wickedneſs, to ever ſo high a degree, the holy ſpirit would 'not be grieved with them, but would, at the end of the above 'period, eminently ſtrive with every creature, even to the ſanc-'tification of every heart.' And when it was ſaid of the Canaanites, as in Joſh. xi. 20. 'It was of the LORD to harden their hearts, 'that they ſhould come againſt Iſrael in battle, that he might deſtroy them utterly;' Dr. H. would ſay, 'It was of the LORD to 'ſend his holy ſpirit into their hearts, to ſave them wholly, or to 'take every one of them to heaven.' And when Joſhua made

that general ſlaughter among the Canaanites, Dr. H. would ſay that Joſhua was thereby inſtrumental of the univerſal out-pouring of God's ſpirit among them; and that God hardened their hearts and brought them againſt Joſhua for this end.

7. Dr. H. cannot be in the leaſt doubt, he muſt certainly know when to rejoice over repenting ſinners. When 'the abandoned 'ſailor whoſe head is taken off with a cannon ball, with an horrid 'oath in his mouth;' when Dr. H. is certain this abandoned creature is dead, he is then certain that he has become a true penitent, and is prepared to rejoice over him on this account. The Doctor aſks the queſtion, 'who dare ſay of this character when 'he is dead, I am certain that man ſhall burn forever in hell?'* But he is certain 'that man' is then become a true penitent, and gone to heaven. He is as certain ſinners are become true penitents as he is certain they are dead. Or he is as certain when ſinners are dead, they have repented and gone to heaven, as he is of the truth of divine revelation. Therefore, he can have not the leaſt heſitation when to rejoice over repenting ſinners, but he has the ſame certainty of the time when as the angels in heaven; and that is when ſinners go down to the dead. Jeremiah ſays, 'Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes a foun-'tain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the ſlain of the 'daughter of my people.' But when ſuch vaſt multitudes, are brought to repentance, Dr. H. on this account, muſt have a day of ſpecial rejoicing.——But it is needleſs to proceed any further, in ſhowing the abſurd conſquences which naturally follow from this ſentiment, that all men die with renewed hearts.

I am &c.

LETTER IV.

Dr. H's definition of the Goſpel compared to what he ſays befel Judas.

My dear Friend,

THE Doctor calls the goſpel *good news.* Thus far we are agreed. The wide difference lies here, he ſtrips the goſpel of all its threatenings. 'The goſpel,' ſays he, 'on whatever page 'of ſacred writ it is found, either in the old teſtament or new; 'whether in types, ſacrifices, prophecies, epiſtles, or any other 'way; knows nothing at all of miſery, or torment, or the puniſhment

* P. 187.

' iſhment of any creature under heaven. I ſhould have ſaid, *any* ' *mere creature.*'* He dwells much on this idea, in many places in his book: Abundantly extoling the good things the goſpel ſpeaks to men, and all the bad things it ſpeaks, all the threatened evils, never, in the leaſt degree come on one of the human race; but all come on Chriſt. ' On this one head,' (on Chriſt he means) ' the goſpel tells us of juſt as much indignation and wrath, ' tribulation and anguiſh, as the whole law of God does from the ' beginning to the end of the bible. ' But as to any mere man, ' the goſpel ſays not one uncomfortable word; quite the reverſe.'†

He alſo holds the revelation of the goſpel, as an outward mean, to be very extenſively uſeful to all nations, or to the whole world of mankind. His meaning is, all men are enlightened, reſtrained, and fitted for heaven, more or leſs, in proportion as they are favoured with the outward privileges of the goſpel. He employs ſeveral pages to illuſtrate and confirm this, by comparing Chriſt, or the goſpel, to the natural ſun. From this illuſtration, the following things are here ſelected.

1. ' The natural ſun revives, quickens, and gives life to all ' things in the natural world: So doth Chriſt with regard to the ' whole ſpiritual world.' ' The natural ſun is certainly and great- ' ly beneficial to the whole world; though not to every part in ' the ſame manner and degree.' ' It is to be obſerved, in gen- ' eral, that there is no ſeaſon of the year, no period of time, no ' hour in the ſtormy day, or midnight darkneſs, in which any ' part of the world is left wholly without any benefit, or even ' conſiderable benefit from the ſun.'‡ He goes on to ſhow how the inhabitants of every climate have communication with each other, &c. &c. ſo that all the world ' always have ſome precious ' things brought forth by the ſun. Juſt ſo with regard to the ' true light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into the ' world.' ' All the human kind are at all times much the better ' for Chriſt.'§ In the ſame connection he tells us, ' Chriſt, by ' his merciful energy, began immediately after the fall to with- ' ſtand the force of man's depravity, and has done ſo ever ſince, ' in a greater or leſs degree, in all human nature, in every child ' of Adam.'‖

2. The pagan world is benefited by the goſpel, comparatively, as the frigid or frozen zones are by the ſun. ' The frigid zones,' he ſays, ' ſeem leaſt of all to feel the bleſſings of that glorious ' luminary; though they have their day, and a long one, and ma- ' ny other benefits derived from the ſun.'¶ ' Every part of the ' pagan world, all nations of the earth unacquainted with divine ' revelation

* P. 42. † P. 43. ‡ P. 136, 137. § P. 138. ‖ P. 144, 145. ¶ P. 137.

'revelation directly or immediately, have indirectly ſomething 'valuable of the ſame light and knowledge, in various degrees 'and meaſures, by connection with the people of God, more or 'leſs, by tradition, communication, &c.—There are no people 'in the world, but what have ſome religion.'* 'All people know 'the truth in ſome degree. All are orthodox in ſome points, 'and right in ſome meaſure.'†

3. 'The covenant people of God, under every diſpenſation, 'may be compared to thoſe climates and regions moſt peculiarly 'under the bleſſings of the natural ſun;'‡ or, 'the regions in-'cluded in the temperate zones.'§

4. 'Each of thoſe parts of the earth, is more bleſſed with the 'benign influence of the ſun at one time than at another; and 'all of them more in the day time than in the night; more in 'the ſerene and clear day than in the dark and gloomy day.'‖ Juſt ſo, the Doctor holds, the Jewiſh diſpenſation had its ſuperior bleſſings, being freed from *night and the dark and gloomy day*. Thus he ſays, 'The firſt openings of divine revelation are 'ſimilar to the firſt ſtreaks of dawning day: Increaſing light is 'like the grey of the morning. 'The Jewiſh diſpenſation was, 'at firſt, like the horizontal beams of the riſing ſun. As light 'was added, under that diſpenſation, the ſun advanced towards 'the meridian. Chriſt and the inſpired apoſtles, with the light 'of that time poured into the world, may compare with the ſun 'in his ſtrength.'¶

Some remarks on the above will decide what is the Doctor's opinion and meaning.

1. He makes this compariſon of the ſun with the goſpel, to argue his main point, the ſalvation of all men. This is to be kept in view.

2. He not only holds the goſpel to be a great bleſſing, in its own nature and tendency, and the great mean which gives light to our dark world; but all men are in fact benefited by it. And in ſuch manner as to fit them for ſalvation, or for heaven; in proportion as they have its outward privileges. If this be not granted, his compariſon is loſt. Should it be ſaid, his meaning is that the goſpel naturally tends to the greateſt good among men, and is really ſuch when rightly improved; but if abuſed, it becomes a ſtone of ſtumbling and rock of offence; this would make nothing for the Doctor. It would only go to deſtroy his ſcheme.

3. We will refer back to his own words. 'The natural ſun 'revives, quickens, and gives life to all things in the natural 'world;

* P. 139, 140. † P. 141. ‡ P. 138. § P. 137. ‖ ibid. ¶ P. 139.

'world: So doth Chriſt with regard to the whole ſpiritual world.' That is, Chriſt revives, quickens, and gives ſpiritual life to the whole ſpiritual world, as the ſun does to all things in the natural world. His words cannot be taken in any other ſenſe. And theſe words are always uſed by divines in this ſenſe. When it is ſaid, Chriſt revives, quickens, and gives life to the whole ſpiritual world, it always means that Chriſt gives ſpiritual life to the whole ſpiritual world. Which ſpiritual life ever intends holy life; eſpecially when this is compared to the natural life or quickening produced by the natural ſun. The Doctor alſo explains it in this manner. 'The natural ſun is greatly beneficial 'to the whole world: Juſt ſo, all the human kind are at all times 'much the better for Chriſt.' Their hearts are *much the better* for what Chriſt has done for them. This muſt be his meaning. For, 'Chriſt, by his merciful energy, began immediately after 'the fall to withſtand the force of man's depravity, and has done 'ſo ever ſince, in a greater or leſs degree, in all human nature, 'in every child of Adam.' The Doctor ſays again, 'The *influ-* 'ence of the Second Adam, the Lord from heaven, *on the hearts* 'of men, has always been ſovereign, and very various; as much 'ſo as the light and influence of the ſun on the earth has been 'in the various parts of it, and in the various ſeaſons of the year: 'Yet all are much the better for the Sun of righteouſneſs.'* Thus he aſſerts, All men are *much the better* for the Sun of righteouſneſs, on account of his *influence on their hearts*. He further confirms this as we have juſt ſeen, by ſaying, 'All people 'know the truth in ſome degree. All are orthodox in ſome 'points, and right in ſome meaſure.'

4. By *the whole ſpiritual world*, juſt mentioned, Dr. H. intends the whole human race. The elect of God and ſpiritual ſeed of Chriſt is the whole human race, as he pretends. 'All 'human nature,' ſays he, 'is his *one entire elect object*, in union 'with Chriſt, as a body with a head.'† Thus the whole ſpiritual world, the whole of mankind Chriſt gives ſpiritual life to, as the ſun revives and quickens all things in the natural world. It is alſo plain Dr. H. here intends all mankind, by *the whole ſpiritual world*, from his ſaying, All the human kind are at all times much the better for Chriſt; and on account of the influence Chriſt has on their hearts. But,

5. The ſun gives life to things in the natural world, in proportion to the light and heat it ſheds upon them. So Chriſt, or the goſpel gives ſpiritual life to men, in proportion as its light ſhines more or leſs among them. This is the Doctor's reaſoning.

* P. 142. † P. 84.

ing. He, however, makes this exception, that 'the temperate 'zones are moſt peculiarly under the bleſſings of the natural ſun.' And the natural bleſſings of theſe climates he compares to the ſpiritual bleſſings enjoyed by the covenant people of God. 'The 'covenant people of God, under every diſpenſation, may be 'compared to thoſe regions moſt peculiarly under the bleſſings 'of the natural ſun, or the regions included in the temperate 'zones.' His reaſoning therefore comes to this, as the ſun quickens and gives life to all things in the temperate climates, ſo the goſpel among the covenant people of God gives ſpiritual life to all men, as its light ſhines more or leſs among them. And throughout the world, and at all times, the goſpel has influence on the hearts of all, proportionable to its degrees of light among them.

6. As the Jews were peculiarly favoured with this light, ſo it muſt have had influence on their hearts in the ſame proportion. From Moſes to Chriſt, the Jews were freed from night, and from the dark gloomy day. The ſun, Dr. H. ſays, 'does more good 'at one time than at another; more in the day time than in the 'night; more in the ſerene and clear day than in the dark and 'gloomy day.' The Jews, in a goſpel ſenſe, from Moſes to Chriſt had their clear ſerene day. 'The firſt openings of divine 'revelation are ſimilar to the firſt ſtreaks of dawning day: In-'creaſing light is like the grey of the morning. The Jewiſh 'diſpenſation was, at firſt, like the horizontal beams of the riſing 'ſun. As light was added, under that diſpenſation, the ſun ad-'vanced towards the meridian. Chriſt and the inſpired apoſtles, 'with the light at that time poured into the world, may compare 'with the ſun in his ſtrength.' Thus far their diſpenſation, as the Doctor aſſerts. It began like the horizontal beams of the riſing ſun, or clear ſhining of the riſing ſun. The ſun ſhed its beams when it firſt roſe, light was ſtill added as the ſun advanced, till it came to its full ſtrength. Which was one clear, increaſing light or day, till it comes to its meridian. But the thing to be noted is the effect this light had on their minds.

As contradictory to the plaineſt facts of ſcripture as this is, Dr. H. has fairly made it out: That the Jews not only had one continued day of increaſing light, but this light more and more quickened, or gave ſpiritual life to them; all of them without exception, from the time of Moſes till the coming of Chriſt. And when Chriſt came, they were enlivened and animated by his light, fitted for heaven, the whole body of them in the moſt marvellous manner. We will now take the ſum of his arguing. The ſun

revives,

revives, chickens, and gives life to *all things* in the natural world: So doth Chriſt to *the whole ſpiritual world*—All men belong to this ſpiritual world—All men are thus revived &c. by Chriſt's influence on their hearts—All men are thus revived according to the degrees of this light and influence among them, or as the light of the goſpel ſhines more or leſs among them—The Jewiſh diſpenſation was one continued increaſing day of goſpel light: Therefore the Jews, during the long term of their diſpenſation, were all of them reviving and preparing for heaven; and more ſo as their light increaſed—When Chriſt and the apoſtles preached the goſpel, it was then in its meridian ſtrength and brightneſs: Therefore all the Jews at this time muſt have had their hearts enlivened and fitted for heaven, in the ſame eminent manner. Not one individual Jew who lived in Chriſt's time does the Doctor except. For then how are all men much the better for Chriſt?—How are the hearts of all men much the better for his influence?—How do all men belong to the ſpiritual world? And how is the whole ſpiritual world enlivened, as all things are in the natural world, by the natural ſun?

Nothing could have been more obvious and natural than for the Doctor to have made exceptions, in the courſe of ſuch a lengthy illuſtration; as well in a natural as in a ſpiritual ſenſe. The moſt fertile parts of the earth, under the moſt happy climate, often bring forth only briars and thorns; which are fit for nothing but to be caſt into the fire. The light of the ſun in one caſe is pleaſant: 'The light of the eyes rejoiceth the heart.'* In another caſe this light is moſt painful. A man's eyes may be in ſuch a diſordered ſtate, as the greater the degree of heat and light, falling upon them, is, the greater is his torment. 'The fourth angel poured out his vial upon the ſun—And men were ſcorched 'with great heat, and blaſphemed the name of God.'† 'The 'LORD will ſmite thee with madneſs, and blindneſs, and aſtoniſhment of heart. And thou ſhalt grope at noon day, as the 'blind gropeth in darkneſs.'‡ 'The counſel of the froward is 'turned headlong. They meet with darkneſs in the day time, 'and grope in the noon day as in the night.'§ Nothing is plainer than that the light of the ſun is the occaſion of the greateſt temporal evil; ſo the light of the goſpel when abuſed only enhances one's ruin. All ſuch things the Doctor carefully avoids, in his brilliant illuſtration, which he carries on for ſeveral pages. He appears to be neceſſitated ſo to do. For 'the goſpel,' he ſays, 'knows nothing at all of miſery or puniſhment to any mere crea-'ture under heaven.' All the evils it threatens come on Chriſt.

Why

* Prov. 15. 30. † Rev. 16. 8. 9. ‡ Deut. 28. 28, 29. §Job 5. 14

Why did he not ſay, all the natural evils, occaſioned by the natural ſun, come on Chriſt? Why did he not ſay, there are no briars and thorns; no ſickneſs, pain, or death; or any evil under the ſun? Leaving out all the evils occaſioned by the natural ſun, the Doctor goes on to compare it to the bleſſing of the goſpel. But we ſee where his wildneſs leads him. He would fain have the Jews, every individual of them at Chriſt's time, made, by the light of the goſpel, as holy and happy as Adam was in paradiſe.

It is granted the Doctor may contradict this, perhaps, in the next page. And he brings up a glaring contradiction to it in his account of Judas. 'Judas,' ſays he, 'went to his own place, 'to a very horrible and ignominious death, in awful anguiſh and 'utter deſpair, in his own mind. His ſoul went, perhaps, to the 'loweſt ſeat provided for the elect human race, by him who 'died for the ſins of the whole world; to the loweſt place among 'all given to Chriſt. Judas being one given to Chriſt, as is ex-'preſsly declared.'*—Judas went to his own place, to the loweſt place among all given to Chriſt. Here is one certainly of the human race, as Dr. H. has taught us, conſigned to the loweſt place in heaven; who was favoured with the meridian light of the goſpel. And Judas not only had theſe ſuperior outward bleſſings, in common with the reſt of the Jews, but he was taken into Chriſt's own family. He attended Chriſt wherever he went, heard all his public inſtructions, and ſaw all his mighty works. He was preſent to hear all the private and intimate inſtructions, the prayers, ſighs, and groans of the bleſſed Jeſus. 'The Lamb of God, which taketh away the ſin of the world,' was conſtantly before his eyes. The grand ſcheme of divine grace, in its utmoſt extent, Judas had an opportunity to learn, if any one of the ſons of men ever had. Notwithſtanding all this, Judas, agreeably to our author, was degraded to the loweſt ſeat in heaven, there to remain to interminable ages. And, in the Doctor's own words, 'Good were it for him, if he had not been born 'that man, or ſuch a man.'† Although he here gives a wrong conſtruction of the text,‡ yet this is a full conceſſion that it would have been far better for Judas, to have been born in ſome remote part of the earth, and ſo lived all his days in the depth of pagan darkneſs. He repreſents it alſo, as a very kind providence which ordered things in ſuch manner, that Judas hanged himſelf ſo ſoon as he did. 'Even this good, almighty government of 'Chriſt ſo ordered, that he hanged himſelf before he had further 'added to his wickedneſs.' It would therefore been a great mercy

* P. 190. † P. 281. ‡ See in Lct. I. Part II.

mercy to the traitor, if providence had removed him out of the world, either by his own hands as the inſtrumental cauſe, or ſome other way, before he had ever ſeen God manifeſt in the fleſh.

But Dr. H. gives a ſad detail of the dreadful things Judas ſuffered in this world. 'Judas,' he ſays, 'was a notable ſon of 'perdition, ſignally ſo, a moſt miſerable, loſt, condemned ſinner, 'until his death; in perdition until that moment, even until ſoul 'and body were ſeparated; until then a ſon of perdition in an 'extraordinary degree.'* 'Judas was loſt in an awful manner; 'he was loſt as an apoſtle of Chriſt; loſt as to all ſervice in this 'world; loſt with regard to all his comfort on earth; loſt as to all 'hope to ſupport his own ſoul here.' 'Judas went to his own 'place, to a very horrible and ignominious death, in awful anguiſh 'and utter deſpair.'* 'He indeed met with an awful and aggra-'vated damnation, in the higheſt ſenſe of the term.'† Dr. H. ſeems to want words to expreſs this higheſt and moſt awful damnation, Judas ſuffered in this world.

But this damnation or curſe, 'in the higheſt ſenſe of the term,' which fell upon the ſon of perdition, muſt be included either in the law or the goſpel. The Doctor ſays, 'the goſpel knows no-'thing at all of miſery, or torment, or the puniſhment of any mere 'creature.' But he muſt now grant that the goſpel makes proviſion, or leaves room for the curſe of the law to take hold of impenitent ſinners. And then it will follow that the curſe of the law, though wholly done away as to believers, is in full force againſt unbelievers. Or at leaſt it was in full force againſt Judas. It will alſo follow that the goſpel delivers over tranſgreſſors, or at leaſt it did deliver over one obſtinate tranſgreſſor, to the curſe of the law. Whether a curſe be contained in the law or the goſpel, it is equally againſt the Doctor. His ſcheme, however, ſhall anſwer for itſelf.—'What God will '*in fact* do with mankind,' ſays he, 'as united to a mediator, —: Or how, in very deed, God hath promiſed to deal with man, 'in that union with the ſecond Adam: What his condition ſhall 'certainly be, in this life, and in the life to come. This I call 'pure goſpel.'‡ The goſpel therefore he calls *the voice of fact*. 'What God will *in fact* do with mankind, as united to a media-'tor.' By this he means all mankind; for he receives 'the me-'diator to be in equal connection with all human nature.' Whatever therefore is *fact*, or whatever takes place in the courſe of providence, 'in this life, and in the life to come,' is the language or fulfilment of 'pure goſpel.' But the *curſe*, or, which is the ſame, *damnation in the higheſt ſenſe*, came on one of the hu-

* P. 189, 193. † P. 262. ‡ P. 26.

man kind. This is declared by Dr. H. to be *a fact*. Therefore a curſe is contained in the goſpel.

Thus far the Doctor's interpretation of the goſpel. At one time, it knows nothing at all of the miſery of any mere human creature. At another, Dr. H. is in want of words to expreſs the height of the curſe, which does *in fact* fall on one mere human creature.

Furthermore, according to Dr. H. what enhanced Judas' wickedneſs, above all things, was his living and dying in oppoſition to the 'bleſſed truth' of univerſaliſm. He had an opportunity, if any of the human kind ever had, to learn this doctrine. But he died 'in awful anguiſh and utter deſpair,'—'loſt as to any hope 'to ſupport his ſoul here.' This obſtinate and perſevering oppoſition to the doctrine of univerſal ſalvation, if the Doctor's words are true, greatly enhanced his ſin. The Doctor often labours to ſhow the aggravated wickedneſs ſuch are guilty of, as do not embrace his ſcheme. And he ſays, , a man is always miſer-'able in this world, in proportion to the degree of wickedneſs that 'governs him.'* Had Judas therefore never heard of the name of Jeſus, or had he known nothing of the goſpel, he could not have been guilty of ſuch aggravated ſin, neither could he have been ſubjected to ſuch exquiſite torment. So that the goſpel eventually proved a vaſt evil to the ſon of perdition. It certainly was, as Dr. H. ſays, the greateſt poſſible evil to him here in time, and a partial evil or curſe to him to eternity; if we allow a privation or partial privation of happineſs to be an evil.

It will here be objected: Judas is perfectly contented with his degraded lot in heaven; being wholly freed from pride and every impure emotion of heart; being perfectly holy, and of courſe completely happy. It will, notwithſtanding, forever remain a truth that Judas would have eſcaped thoſe inexpreſſible evils here in time, and enjoyed greater degrees of happineſs in eternity, had he been all his days wholly ſhut out from the direct knowledge of the goſpel: this muſt be granted on the ground of univerſaliſm. And on the ſame ground, muſt be granted what the apoſtle Peter ſays, to have its import without end: 'It had been better for them 'not to have known the way of righteouſneſs, than, after they have 'known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them.' And Dr. H. ſays that there will be, among the redeemed in heaven, great and everlaſting deſtruction. Theſe are like to be made, however, not in favour of every one who is 'moſt peculiarly 'under the bleſſings of the goſpel.'

Here it will be objected: The goſpel is in itſelf the greateſt bleſſing

* P. 234.

bleſſing; freely tendering all poſſible good to wretched men. And thoſe that obey it reap the bleſſing, without any intermixture of evil. While on the other hand, ſuch as abuſe its privileges ſuffer the juſt deſert of their crime. Hence, it is the ſin of men and not the goſpel, that occaſions all the evil men ſuffer.

This objection virtually ſuppoſes the goſpel to be in itſelf a bleſſing; the greateſt poſſible outward bleſſing, having a tendency to make all men conſummately happy. But, at the ſame time, it makes proviſion for the juſt puniſhment of ſuch as wantonly abuſe it. Therefore, the goſpel when rightly improved becomes truly a bleſſing, to ſuch as rightly improve it. But when abuſed it eventually proves a curſe; or it is the occaſion of the greateſt curſe to ſuch as abuſe it. But this, if the point be ſettled as to the juſt deſert of ſin, is giving up the whole matter in diſpute

It will again be objected: Judas, though he endured ſuch amazing ſufferings here in the body, and 'his ſoul went to the 'loweſt place among all given to Chriſt,' will, notwithſtanding, be completely happy forever. Whereas, had it not been for the interpoſition of the Redeemer, and the revelation of the goſpel, he muſt have been everlaſtingly miſerable in hell. The goſpel therefore has proved, on the whole, a very great bleſſing to Judas.

In anſwering this, the Doctor utterly reprobates the idea of the divine Being's forming a ſyſtem which is on the whole good, or good and 'glorious in the main.' He utterly abhors the idea, that a Being unlimited in his perfection ſhould form a ſyſtem as good as he poſſibly could, according to the nature of things. 'Whence,' ſays he, 'does the nature of things originate? Certainly from 'God and his attributes only. For in that period of duration 'when there was nothing exiſtent but God, where was the nature 'of things, or the neceſſity of nature, but in God only? To ſup-'poſe there was any limitation upon the eternal Being, when no 'other Being did exiſt, is to ſuppoſe that his own unlimited attri-'butes did limit, and ſet bounds to his conduct, or the emana-'tions of his infinite love and benevolence. It is to ſay, that God 'would have done better if he could; but that he could not: 'He acted out himſelf with as much kindneſs as he could, and 'wiſhed to have been more kind, had it been poſſible in the na-'ture of things; that is, in the nature of his own perfections, 'which gave nature to all things elſe: That his infinite wiſdom 'power and love, could do no better than to exhibit a ſyſtem *glo-'rious in the main*; but at the expenſe of the unutterable, end-

leſs

'leſs miſery of countleſs myriads of his own offspring. This lays 'a limitation on the Moſt High, ariſing from his own attributes; 'becauſe thence flows the whole nature of things, as their nature 'cannot flow from non-entity.'*† This very plauſible argument, here deduced by our author to diſprove future puniſhment, does clearly argue the ſyſtem formed by the divine Being, to be in every ſenſe unlimited: Or ſuited not only to the higheſt good of rational creatures in general, but to the higheſt good of each individual. And this the Doctor further confirms, in theſe words: 'All the evil of every kind that hath exiſted, or ſhall exiſt is 'real good in the whole connection; not only to the *ſyſtem* '*in general*, but to *every individual* in it, capable of rational 'happineſs.'‡

From theſe quotations and other things in his book, Dr. H. appears to improve this argument, drawn from the divine attributes, as a ground work on which he very much builds his ſcheme. Agreeable to Dr. H. therefore, as the attributes of Deity are unlimited, ſo the ſyſtem of rational created beings cannot be conſidered as limited, or good in the main, neither in a collective nor individual ſenſe. But the higheſt good of each individual muſt be promoted and ſecured, as well as the higheſt good of the whole. And even in ſuch manner as that all the evil of every kind 'that 'hath ever exiſted, or ſhall exiſt, is real good in the whole con-'nection; not only to the *ſyſtem in general*, but to every indi-'vidual in it, capable of rational happineſs.' To ſay then, as the above objection does, The goſpel was, in a partial view, or in the main, a bleſſing to Judas, is a direct contradiction to one of the Doctor's leading principles. And however he may plead, that Judas could not have been ſaved had it not been for the interpoſition of the Mediator, but muſt have been miſerable without end; yet he muſt grant it would have been far better for the ſon of perdition, had he been all his days involved in pagan darkneſs. Why then did not 'the unreſtrained power, wiſdom 'and goodneſs of God' confine Judas, in ſome dark corner of the earth? And how is 'all the evil of every kind that hath ever ex-'iſted, or ſhall exiſt, a real good to every individual;' if the ſon of perdition, after he has ſuffered 'damnation in the higheſt ſenſe,' be degraded to the loweſt ſeat in heaven? He was elected, by the Saviour himſelf, a candidate for one of the higheſt ſeats in heaven. But if 'he was loſt,' as Dr. H. ſays, 'with reſpect to the 'proper

* P. 296, 297. † In this ſpecious way of arguing, Dr. H. might as well go on to prove the created ſyſtem to be infinite, becauſe God is infinite. Ethan Allen attempts to prove that creation is eternal, becauſe God is eternal. See *Oracles of reaſon*, under the head of creation's being eternal. ‡ P. 298.

'proper ſeat of one of the twelve apoſtles in the world to come, 'and with reſpect to that dignified lot, in this world, which Mat-'thias took in his place,'* and appointed 'to the loweſt place 'among all given to Chriſt;' certainly he was loſt with reſpect to a very great degree of eternal happineſs and glory. His fall was great indeed. Indeed if he fell from the higheſt to the loweſt ſeat in heaven, as is expreſsly aſſerted he did, this does as truly break in upon our author's unlimited plan, as though he had fallen to the loweſt place in hell. When one falls from ten degrees of happinſs, the fall is as great as when another falls ten degrees lower in miſery. But when one falls ten degrees lower, either from happineſs or into miſery; by the ſame rule he may fall twenty, provided he deſerve thus to fall. If one falls, however, ten degrees, there muſt be a firm foundation on which he can reſt, to prevent his falling ſtill lower. If therefore, 'Judas by tranſ-'greſſion fell' from that exalted ſtate of happineſs, if he fell to the loweſt ſtate of happineſs, Dr. H's firm foundation utterly fails. And we can ſee no reaſon why he ſhould not fall to the loweſt place of endleſs torment; or to his full deſert of ſin. If he has received one half of the reward of his iniquity, or what bears a ſtriking likeneſs to it, what reaſon can be given why he ſhould not receive his full reward? If the all-atoning blood of Jeſus, from which Dr. H. would argue every thing, and of courſe prove nothing; if this, or if the unlimited 'emanations of divine love,' did not prevent Judas'falling thus far'; what could prevent his plunging ſtill lower, even to the full reward of his deeds done in the body?

It is granted that the fall of any rational creature, either to lower degrees of happineſs, or to greater degrees of miſery, is inconſiſtent with unlimited goodneſs, unleſs ſuch fall can anſwer, proportionably, a valuable end; and unleſs the creature ſo falling juſtly deſerves it. 'The fall of the Jews was the riches of the 'world, and the diminiſhing of them the riches of the Gentiles.'† Unlimited goodneſs required this awful event, as it related to the Jews; to bring about, however, this moſt valuable end relating to the Gentiles. If therefore, the unlimited Being can accompliſh the beſt of purpoſes, by ſending temporal judgements on part of our race, and that for a long ſucceſſion of ages; doubtleſs the ſame Being can accompliſh the higheſt valuable end, by ſending endleſs curſes on part of mankind. It is limiting the holy One of Iſrael to ſay he cannot; eſpecially as he has expreſsly declared, he will thus inflict endleſs curſes. That ſcheme is limited above all others, which ſuppoſes evils, either temporal or eternal,

* P. 199. † Rom. 11. 12.

eternal, to exiſt, which anſwer no good end. Again, that ſcheme is the moſt unlimited which ſuppoſes the higheſt created good to exiſt, even at the expenſe of miſery, whether temporal or eternal, and juſt ſo much of it as is ſuited to the end, or as infinite wiſdom ſhall order.

But Dr. H. has ſhown us no valuable end whatever, occaſioned by the fall of Judas. Should it be ſaid, Judas was long foretold by the prophets, with the events and circumſtances concerning him; ſo the evil he ſuffered in this life anſwered the beſt of purpoſes, being a *neceſſary* attendant of the death and ſufferings of Chriſt. Still it might be enquired, on what ground it was *neceſſary*? It is preſumed the Doctor could not anſwer this queſtion, ſhort of giving up his whole ſcheme. For, if the temporal damnation of Judas was a neceſſary attendant of the death of Chriſt, to illuſtrate it, or to illuſtrate any important truth, in this world: why not the eternal damnation of Judas? Is it of more importance for truth to be illuſtrated in this, than in the coming world? Or in which world will truth be illuſtrated with the greateſt clearneſs? But Dr. H. ſays, 'to imagine there is any need of 'the *eternal perſonal torment* of any ſinner of the human race, 'in order further to illuſtrate the holineſs and juſtice of God, the 'infinite evil of ſin; or further to impreſs the minds of the in-'telligent ſyſtem with a ſenſe of the infinite odiouſneſs of ſin, and 'the infinite purity of God, and his infinite hatred of all ſin, is 'plainly to ſuppoſe that the great work of the Son of God can 'admit of ſome amendment; that in very deed it is not a finiſh-'ed work—Is an amazing reflection on him who ſaid '*It is fin-*"*iſhed.*' when he bowed his head and gave up the ghoſt.' Dr. H. dwells much upon this, to ſhow that the ſufferings of mere creatures or even their eternal ſufferings can anſwer none of theſe ends. To imagine they can, he ſays, is only a reflection on what Chriſt has done and ſuffered—' is plainly to ſuppoſe that the great 'work of the Son of God can admit of ſome amendment.' On this ground therefore, to ſuppoſe that the ſufferings of Judas, his height of damnation, could be of uſe as a neceſſary attendant of the death of Chriſt, further to illuſtrate divine juſtice, divine hatred to ſin, or the infinite evil of ſin; is alſo a reflection on the finiſhed work of Chriſt. Certainly, if the eternal ſufferings of creatures can be of no uſe in this way, their temporal ſufferings cannot. And, to ſuppoſe the former can be of uſe in this way, if this caſts a reflection on what Chriſt has done, then to ſuppoſe the latter can be of uſe in this way, caſts the ſame reflection on

what

what Chriſt has done. Thus the Doctor has wholly cut himſelf off: he cannot plead the ſufferings of Judas, he tells of, as being neceſſary for any of the above purpoſes.

Neither can he plead Judas' ſufferings as a neceſſary event with the death of Chriſt, and long foretold, to convince the world that Chriſt is the true Saviour. This would bring us back on the ſame ground again. Why ſhould an unlimited Being be neceſſitated to connect the temporal damnation of one man with the death of the Saviour of all men? And to place the matter beyond diſpute that he was come, according to ancient prophecies, to ſave all men, he muſt firſt, 'in fact,' damn one!* The Doctor ſpurns at this idea, as in theſe words: 'It is to ſay, that 'God would have done better if he could; but that he could not: 'He acted out himſelf with as much kindneſs as he could, and 'wiſhed to have been more kind, had it been poſſible, in the na-'ture of things.'

Neither can Dr. H. plead that moſt awful anguiſh and torment of Judas to have been uſeful in leading him to repentance. 'Afflictions,' he ſays, 'in this world, do not make ſinners any 'better; but are invariably, only an occaſion of their growing 'worſe and worſe, if the ſpecial, almighty energy of the divine 'ſpirit does not attend them.'† But, if we credit the Doctor, the ſpecial energy of the divine ſpirit did not attend that 'utmoſt tor-'ment' of Judas; for 'he died in awful anguiſh and utter deſ-'pair.' So his damnation was only the occaſion of his growing worſe and worſe. And as he is now cut off from a vaſt proportion of happineſs, reduced to the loweſt ſtage of it, among all the redeemed, as Dr. H. pretends; we cannot ſee the leaſt advantage ariſing to him from his former ſufferings. He is no more bleſſed in eternity, for having been damned in time. Dr. H. cannot plead that Judas muſt have been damned in eternity, had he not been damned in time. For this would argue that he is not now ſaved by Chriſt: or that his damnation was ſome way meritorious as to his ſalvation. Or this plea made by Dr. H. would contradict his *unlimited plan*, we have juſt ſeen.—Neither can the Doctor plead again, thoſe unexampled ſufferings of Judas to have beeu inſtrumental in preparing him for higher enjoyments in heaven. This would deny what he has aſſerted as to the place of Judas in heaven.

After all, the Doctor, or his advocates will ſtill urge thoſe ſufferings of Judas, to have been the occaſion of ſpecial good; by exhibiting

* It is ſometimes difficult to know whether Dr. Huntington is moſt at war with himſelf or his Maker. † P. 206.

exhibiting a moſt ſolemn warning, in all after ages, to ſuch as reject a crucified Redeemer, or turn traitors to the cauſe of righteouſneſs. This is granted at once, but then the Doctor's plan muſt be wholly rejected. Going on his plan, it is only adding to the catalogue of his contradictions. For this is granting the diſtinguiſhed bleſſings of the goſpel to be the occaſion of the greateſt curſe to one, who abuſes them; ſo to render them a more rich bleſſing to another. And that God ſees fit to make the miſery of one, the occaſion of happineſs to another. Which is granting the truth. But Dr. H. would ſay of this, 'though the goſpel be 'glad tidings of great joy to one, yet it is very ſad tidings to ano-'ther.'* Alſo, that 'the great work of the Son of God can ad-'mit of ſome amendment.'

Thus the entire uſeleſſneſs, on Dr. H's plan, of thoſe inexpreſſible evils which befel one of the human race. They were of no uſe in the awful hour of Chriſt's death; either further to illuſtrate the divine attributes, or to mark out the real Saviour, according to ancient prophecies, or to exhibit to men a more ſolemn warning againſt ſin. Neither were they in any ſenſe the occaſion of good to Judas. Hence, we ſee where Dr. H. is now driven to, and where every univerſaliſt muſt be driven, when his ſcheme is followed up. This ſhocking conſequence, and as blaſphemous as it is, Dr. H. cannot eſcape it. Viz. 'God takes 'pleaſure in that painful death of Judas: God takes pleaſure in 'his endleſs degraded ſtate in heaven. And this divine pleaſure 'is not an holy pleaſure, it is not ſuited to promote the higheſt 'good of the created ſyſtem; but this divine pleaſure is merely 'ſelf-gratification!' And this is equally degrading to the great God himſelf! If God can, in one ſingle inſtance, inflict evil, or puniſhment on any one of his rational creatures, without promoting the good of others by it, however this rational creature ſo puniſhed may deſerve it; it cannot then be ſtrictly ſaid, 'The 'goodneſs of God endureth continually.'† And if God may, without doing any good whatever, torment one of his rational creatures for the ſpace of one hour, then may God do the ſame for the ſpace of two hours, four hours, and ſo on without end. On the Doctor's plan, therefore it is wholly uncertain how great evils of every kind may yet exiſt. On his plan alſo, it is wholly uncertain how far the evil of every kind may yet overbalance the good. Yea, if the divine Being can, according to Dr. H. in one inſtance, do evil, or inflict evil on one of his accountable creatures, without doing any good by it to another, we have then nothing to enſure

* P. 177. † Pſal. 52. 1.

enſure us but what all created good will, finally, to give place to created evil, be baniſhed from the univerſe. The Doctor's plan of courſe is, above all others, the moſt limited. Unleſs it be an unlimited plan of evil.

But it was impoſſible for him to have pointed out, directly, any good end to be anſwered by what befel Judas. Unleſs he had, in the ſame precept, ſo far invalidated his main arguments. It was alſo impoſſible for him, with any colour of conſiſtency, to have wholly omitted this notable caſe of Judas. But in his arduous taſk of getting 'the ſon of perdition' out of hell, he has wholly defaced his own picturesque account of the Jewiſh ſtate, in its meridian glory of goſpel ordinances: He has made the richeſt bleſſings of the goſpel, as outward means, terminate in a curſe; to one of the human kind, certainly, and that without doing the leaſt good to others: He has contradicted the main arguments uſed to ſupport his own ſcheme: He has degraded one of the inhabitants of heaven: He has indeed degraded all heaven: Yea, he has degraded the great God himſelf!

I am, &c.

LETTER V.

Dr. H's definition of the goſpel compared to what he ſays of the apoſtate Jews, and of the Limitarians his opponents.

My dear Friend,

THE Doctor claſſes the unbelieving Jews with 'the ſon of perdition;' or he gives the ſame character to thoſe who crucified Chriſt, and perſecuted his diſciples, as he does to Judas. Having recourſe to what the apoſtle Paul ſaid of the unbelieving Jews. 'The apoſtle bewails,' he ſays, 'from his own former bitter experience, hardneſs of heart, and enmity againſt 'Chriſt; the miſerable caſe of that nation as a body. They 'wiſhed themſelves at the greateſt diſtance from Chriſt, and all 'his offered grace.'—'He ſaw but very few of them reconciled 'to their Meſſiah, or in the knowledge and enjoyment of the benefit; only a remnant poſſeſſing the knowledge, ſenſe, and comfort of ſalvation.' 'Many more gentiles had come to the knowledge and comfort of eternal ſalvation than of the Jews.'* The great body of the Jewiſh nation, therefore, 'only a remnant' excepted,

* P. 90.

cepted, is here characterized as having an utter contempt and abhorrence of the glad tidings of the goſpel. 'They wiſhed themſelves at the greateſt diſtance from Chriſt, and all his offered 'grace.' And they were filled with 'hardneſs of heart and bitter enmity' againſt Chriſt; the ſame as filled the heart of Judas, after ſatan entered into him, and ſtirred him up to betray Chriſt. The Jews of courſe were far more envious to the doctrines of the croſs than the Gentiles. 'Many more gentiles had come to the 'knowledge and comfort of eternal ſalvation than of the Jews.'

The Doctor ſuppoſes their enormous ſin to have been their pointed oppoſition to the doctrine of univerſal ſalvation: preached, as he aſſerts, by Chriſt and his apoſtles. 'They rejected,' ſays he, 'an all-ſufficient atonement, and eternal life, on the ſame 'footing that any publican might have it, or any poor ſcandalous '*dog* of the gentile world. For they gave other nations no better epithet. They did not at all underſtand how, *in Chriſt* (the 'only character that God hath the leaſt reſpect unto in *the final* '*ſalvation of all men*) every valley was filled, and every mountain and hill made low.'* 'And when the goſpel door was ſet 'open to *all nations* of the earth, as well as to the Jews, the 'doctrine (of univerſal ſalvation) was ſo ſtrange, ſo far beyond 'all the notions of grace and ſalvation, ever entertained among 'the covenant people of God; and ſo exceeding mortifying to 'the pride of their hearts, that it was abhorred and rejected.—Indeed, when Jeſus firſt gave this intimation (of the ſalvation of 'all men), they, who had juſt been gazing at him with pleaſing 'wonder, were ſo chagrined at the idea that a whole world of *hea*'*then dogs* ſhould be ſet on a footing as reſpectable as themſelves, that they wiſhed him nothing better than inſtant death.'† Thus the enormous ſin of the Jews: and the reaſon why they were ſo enraged at Chriſt, as Dr. H. ſays, was becauſe he preached univerſal ſalvation.

The Doctor proceeds further, to give the reaſon or cauſe of the Jews being ſo enraged at Chriſt for his preaching this doctrine. 'The motive,' he ſays, 'why the Jews were more malicious perſecutors of Chriſt, and the primitive chriſtians, than other men, 'was quite natural to all mankind. It was not becauſe they were 'worſe than other men, or more malicious by nature; but they 'had been ſo long honoured of God, and diſtinguiſhed by peculiar *privileges*, that they felt them in their hearts as a monopoly: Even as a man deſcended from an ancient, noble family, has 'no idea that it is fit, in the courſe of providence, that the children of beggars immemorial, ſhould ever become as rich and no-

'ble

* P. 90. † P. 89.

'ble as himſelf and his poſterity. This is human nature in every 'age.'* It was not therefore becauſe the Jews were worſe by nature, but it was what is common to human nature in every age. Which is the ſame as aſſerting that men are naturally ſelfiſh, and ſo ſelfiſh as to graſp in, or monopolize ſpiritual things, as they would temporal things. Every man is ſo ſelfiſh by nature, he would take all happineſs to himſelf, and leave the reſt of the world to eternal miſery. Or, at leaſt, that all the reſt of the world ſhould either have happineſs or miſery, to eternity, juſt ſo as would moſt contribute to his own eternal happineſs. So as a rich miſer would make all the world his ſlaves, or in the beſt way ſubſervient to his own avarice. This is plainly the Doctor's reaſoning. And the longer the Jews were favoured with *the peculiar privileges* of revelation or the goſpel, the more this monopolizing ſpirit in them increaſed, and the more they deſpiſed Chriſt and his diſciples. Thus far he gives the Jews their character: having that ſame proud, covetous, perſecuting ſpirit as Judas had, when he ſold his Maſter for thirty pieces of ſilver.

But in giving the character of the unbelieving Jews, Dr. H. gives that of the *limitarians* his opponents. For he often involves them both in one. 'The calviniſtic ſcheme, in the *limi-* 'tarian ſenſe,' he ſays, 'is *full* of contradiction and abſurdity. 'The ſame may be ſaid of all the reſt that ever have been advanced 'in the world, except this alone,'† that is, his own ſcheme. A viler character can hardly be given, certainly as it relates to articles of faith if not of practice, than the Doctor here gives of thoſe who hold to future puniſhment. Yea, he here characterizes all others, in the ſame manner, that bear the chriſtian name. 'The 'ſame may be ſaid of all the reſt,' of all ſchemes of religion that have ever been advanced, except his own.—Of the preaching of his opponents he ſays, 'it hath always been clear demonſtra- 'tion, that there is great duplicity and illuſion in it.'‡ The Doctor continues, 'the *limitarian* plan gives ſatan a grand victory 'and triumph, in all he had in view, or ever had any hope to ac- 'compliſh. It conſiders Chriſt as concurring with him, *in the* 'main, in all that he deſired.'§ 'Another argument againſt the 'limitarian ſcheme is this: No man, on their principles, can do his 'duty; even if his whole heart and diſpoſition were perfectly 'right.'‖ 'God's law of nature cries out againſt it, with all the 'authority of the divine Being himſelf.'¶ 'Indeed there is no 'ſalvation, on the *limitarian* plan; but the ſame that was ſo plea- 'ſing to that devout phariſee in the temple, Luke xviii.'** 'On 'the limitarian plan, they, who are ſaved, will be ſaved by their own 'works.

* P. 39, 40. † P. 182. ‡ P. 184. § P. 213 ‖ P. 285. ¶ P. 278. ** P. 304.

'works.—Yea, they are ſaved by their own merit, ſo far as we 'can have any notion of merit in a crature.'† Thus the Doctor goes on to blacken the character of his opponents. They join with the proud phariſee, the moſt bitter enemies of Chriſt, and join with ſatan in all that he does, &c. &c. He not only ſays theſe things of the limitarians, but he ſays, they ſay, even by their religious profeſſion, 'all that the proud phariſees ever did ſay, and 'all that the proudeſt man on earth ever did, or can ſay.'‡ And he directly intimates that they hold God to be 'a God of ſome 'love and of great malevolence,' and even 'a diſpoſition to infi-'nite malevolence.'§

The Doctor could hardly have ſaid more, in ſo few words, than he here ſays againſt his opponents, or thoſe who hold to endleſs puniſhment. But he has ſaid all this againſt himſelf, as much as he has againſt them. So all he has ſaid againſt the apoſtate Jews, turns againſt himſelf. For,

1. What he has ſaid againſt each of them is a contradiction to his *meridian glory* of the goſpel, and its peculiar benefits to men. See in laſt Letter.

Nearly all the chriſtian world, ſince the days of Chriſt, have held to endleſs puniſhment, or have been *limitarians*, as he invidiouſly calls them. Origen, in the third century, was the firſt to invent and publiſh univerſaliſm. But this ſcheme never ſucceeded till about thirty years paſt. And a conſiderable part of its new proſelytes have already gone off to deiſm. So that the chriſtian world has been, ſtill is, and ſtill like to be, of this vile deſcription given by Dr. H; only a ſmall remnant of univerſaliſts excepted. And theſe he equally reprobates with all others. All ſchemes of religion but his own, and originated by himſelf, as he pretends, are *full of contradiction and abſurdity*. Here we have the Doctor's picture of all chriſtendom; from Chriſt's day to the preſent, totally involved in darkneſs. Far greater darkneſs than that among the moſt ignorant heathen; for 'they 'are all orthodox in ſome points,' he ſays, 'and right in ſome 'meaſure.'‖ But the whole chriſtian world has hitherto been one continued ſtate of darkneſs, and becauſe they have not believed in his ſcheme. Again, the unbelieving Jews the Doctor has marked with the ſame blindneſs; giving them the ſame vile character, and making their chief crime their oppoſition to univerſal ſalvation. He alſo allows this doctrine was never thought of before Chriſt's time. When the Jews firſt heard it preached by Chriſt, as Dr. H. ſays, 'the doctrine was ſo ſtrange, ſo far 'beyond all the notions of grace and ſalvation, ever entertained

'among

† P. 301. ‡ P. 302. § P. 221, 222. ‖ P. 141.

'among the covenant people of God.'—This is a plain conceſſion that the Jewiſh nation had in every preceding age been in this groſs blindneſs, entirely ignorant of the doctrine of the ſalvation of all men. And when Chriſt preached it, as Dr. H. pretends, the great body of the Jews rejected it, and ſtill remained in their blindneſs. Thus the Doctor deſcribes both the Jewiſh and the chriſtian ſtate, to be a ſtate of midnight darkneſs; all along from Moſes to Chriſt, ſo down to his own day.

Now, how does this compare with what Dr. H. calls *the meridian glory* of goſpel light?—'The Jewiſh diſpenſation was, 'at firſt, like the horizontal beams of the riſing ſun. As light 'was added, under that diſpenſation, the ſun advanced towards 'the meridian. Chriſt and the inſpired apoſtles, with the light at 'that time poured in upon the world, may compare with the ſun 'in his ſtrength.'—'So the bleſſings of the great Redeemer have 'been increaſing, ſince he was on earth in the form of man.'* 'The Moſt High ſpeaks of the light of Chriſt, as a growing and 'ſpreading light, until in the end, all the world ſhall behold his 'glorious beams, and feel his ſaving power.'†—This the Doctor ſays in one place; then again all is left in darkneſs—*full of contradiction and abſurdity.* The reaſon is, they have ſo generally rejected his ſcheme. And this leaves the world in a moſt diſmal caſe indeed, according to Dr. H's aſſertion.

Beſides, where are the peculiar benefits of the goſpel? 'The 'covenant people of God, under every diſpenſation,' the Doctor ſays, 'may be compared to thoſe climates and regions moſt pe-'culiarly under the bleſſings of the natural ſun.'‡ And the goſpel, like the natural ſun, has influence on the hearts of all men according to its degrees of light among them. All men are much the better for the goſpel: and better in proportion as they have its outward means. Therefore, the covenant people of God, all of them, are eminently revived, quickened, and made holy by the influence of the goſpel. Theſe things the Doctor holds, as we have ſeen in the laſt Letter, to which the Reader is referred. Now, what becomes of theſe peculiar bleſſings? The Jews were much more wicked, he ſays, than the gentiles. 'Many more 'gentiles had come to the knowledge of ſalvation than the Jews.' The longer they had been favoured with the oracles of God, the more was their proud monopolizing ſpirit increaſed; which vented itſelf againſt the whole gentile world. And eſpecially vented itſelf in the utmoſt rage againſt Chriſt, as Dr. H. ſays, for his preaching univerſal ſalvation. So to the limitarians it would have been difficult, if not impoſſible, for him to have given a more

* P. 139. † P. 142. ‡ P. 138.

more vile character. As he makes them join with ſatan in all he does, and even call God infinitely malevolent. This is what he ſays of the whole body of this people, from Chriſt's time to the preſent.

The truth of the caſe is, the Doctor was obliged to ſet them forth in this odious, contemptuous manner; becauſe they deny univerſal ſalvation. Then again he was obliged to give them the beſt of characters: all men much the better for Chriſt, and better as they have greater outward advantages; becauſe all men are equally united to Chriſt. It would have been very odd and inconſiſtent for him to have told of this union between Chriſt and all human nature, had he not conſidered all men as being better on this account. And better, more revived, quickened, and brought back to a ſtate of holineſs, as they have greater goſpel privileges. Again, it would have been equally odd and out of joint, for him to have told of this long continued oppoſition to univerſal ſalvation, as he ſays the limitarians are guilty of, had he not given them the blackeſt character in the ſame connection. Thus he was obliged to make them exceeding good and exceeding bad, at the ſame time: in one connection as bad as ſatan himſelf, in another the greateſt of ſaints.

2. Why the Jews were ſo oppoſed to univerſal ſalvation, Dr. H. ſays, was becauſe of the original depravity of human nature. 'Not becauſe they were worſe than other men, or more vicious 'by nature. It was that native depravity of heart common to 'men in all ages.' Which argues as plainly as words can, that all men are naturally oppoſed to univerſal ſalvation. And he would infer that this is the ground of the limitarian oppoſition to this doctrine. But this is as much againſt himſelf as it is againſt his opponents. It is a direct contradiction to one of his chief arguments. All men naturally feel a ſtrong deſire that every one of their fellow men might be made forever happy. All men have the ſtrongeſt averſion to the endleſs miſery of their fellow mortals, and the moſt ardent love for their endleſs felicity. God himſelf has implanted this principle in their breaſts; elſe how came it there? And this love, in poor imperfect mortals, is only a faint image of the infinite love of the infinite God, for the ſalvation of all men. Therefore, it is moſt certain all men will be ſaved. For what can reſiſt the love or deſire of God? This is one formidable argument among Univerſaliſts. The Doctor lays ſpecial dependance upon it.* Then again he poſitively denies it, as we have juſt ſeen. It would ſeem that he could not ſay things bad enough againſt the apoſtate Jews and limitarians, becauſe

* See p. 278, 322.

becauſe they ſo ſtrenuouſly oppoſe his ſcheme. As he makes no diſtinction between the apoſtate Jews and limitarians, as to character, ſo he charges the latter as well as the former, and all of them without exception, with retaining their natural pride and enmity of heart againſt 'the bleſſed truth' he maintains.' And that this native enmity of heart has never been ſubdued in the leaſt degree; but that they wax worſe and worſe, joining with ſatan in all he does. In this way he would account for their ſtedfaſt oppoſition to his doctrine. But while he declaims againſt them, he only deſtroys one principal ſupport of his own ſcheme.

To ſay that all men have this deſire and love for the eternal happineſs of every one of their fellow mortals, and that the bible plainly teaches all will be ſaved, is a ſelf-evident falſehood. The bible plainly teaches all will be ſaved, and all men naturally deſire, yea moſt ſtrongly deſire juſt as the bible plainly teaches. Hence, it is impoſſible, with the bible in their hands, any ſhould ever believe the doctrine of endleſs puniſhment. Allowing men are educated to believe this doctrine; the queſtion is, how came men firſt to believe it, when they naturally and ſtrongly deſire the contrary, and the bible plainly teaches the contrary?

The only objection that can here be brought, is, that the bible does indeed teach the ſalvation of all men; though not ſo clearly as to have it readily underſtood, or underſtood at firſt. But God gives light more and more, particularly to individuals; and of late this doctrine has been better underſtood than formerly it was. Whereas this deſire and love in the hearts of men by nature, for the ſalvation of all, is clear and undeniable, every one knows he has it. Though men may ſtrive to ſuppreſs it, yet it is evidently the law of nature, and the law of God written in every man's heart, in all ages.—Dr. H. cannot make this objection without denying of it again. For then he muſt give his opponents quite a different character; and to this he will never yield.

But to anſwer this, the objection ſuppoſes that the law of nature, what all men naturally have without Revelation, is clear and undeniable. Whereas, Revelation is not ſo clear, not ſo readily underſtood. That is, the law of nature is more plain and intelligible than Revelation itſelf, ever ſince Chriſt has come *the light of the world*. This objection, therefore, caſts ſuch contempt on Revelation, it cannot be admitted.

That all men have a natural abhorrence to pain and miſery of every kind, cannot be denied. But nothing can be argued from this. For if it be a rule in one caſe, it is in another. And then we may as well argue we ſhall never have pain, ſickneſs, or death. If this abhorrence be only a faint image of the divine

mind

mind and will, then may we infer that he will bring none of these evils upon us. So may we run into the greatest delusion. Again, men's hearts are naturally selfish; they are haters of God and haters of one another. Thus scripture gives the character of all men by nature. Hence, it is absurd to suppose natural men desire the happiness of the whole, out of pure love or benevolence to the whole.

3. The apostate Jews that crucified Christ, Dr. H. supposes were just as criminal as Judas. He also appears to say much the same of the whole race of this people, from Moses to Christ. 'Good distinctions,' he says, 'are the only things men boast of, 'or at least, what they value as good. If they come in a way of 'mere grace, without any hand of theirs in them, they always 'feel more pride in them, than if they came by their own good 'efforts.'* The Doctor means to apply this to the covenant people of God, Jews and Christians, in every age. By these 'good distinctions' he intends the outward means of grace and salvation. And here he says 'they *always* feel more pride in 'them, if they come in a way of mere grace,' &c. That is, the covenant people of God *always*, and without excepting any one, *feel more pride* in their outward means of salvation, if they come in a way of mere grace, than if they come by their own good efforts. He says this to make us believe that 'good ef-'forts,' as prayer, thanksgiving, perseverence in alms and good deeds, make no difference as to our eternal salvation. But these outward services and privileges always, without exception, tend only to nourish spiritual pride. For he says again, 'Eminent 'advances in *grace* and favor in this life are strong incentives of 'pride, in the most exalted saints on earth. They are so. They 'always were, and always will be, so long as any moral depravity remains, or any principle of pride in their hearts.'† Why did he not say, the more saints feel humble, the more do they increase in pride? For he here intends 'eminent advances of 'sanctifying grace' in the heart, as well as outward favours. 'Paul found it so,' he says immediately after, 'when God, of 'his *free grace*, set him at the greatest distance from others, by 'special discoveries and divine raptures.'‡ *Divine raptures*, the Doctor himself supposes, ever intend *love*, *peace*, *joy*, or *divine grace* in the heart. Thus we have his *strong incentives to pride*, in the most exalted saints on earth. But this shows us what character he gives the visible people of God, and the most distinguished saints among them. He says this to reduce gracious or holy exercises of heart to nothing, or that they end

* P. 251. † P. 154. ‡ Ibid.

end in ſpiritual pride. So he would make us believe one ſtands as fair for ſalvation as another. Or if any preference, it is to ſuch as deſpiſe ſanctifying grace.

Therefore, according to Dr. H, not only thoſe Jews that crucified Chriſt, but all along under their diſpenſation they were exceeding proud, monopolizing and covetous; like the traitor that loved the thirty pieces of ſilver more than he did his Maſter. For they all along had thoſe 'good diſtinctions of mere grace,' which, he ſays, always make men proud and ſelfiſh. And ſuch as had real grace, and eminent advances of grace in their hearts, were ſtill more like Judas; having ſtronger incentives to pride, which always, in this life, fill them with ſpiritual pride. Thus far Dr. H, to help Judas himſelf, and all unbelievers with him, along to heaven; alſo to ſhow why the Jews were not Univerſaliſts; has made the Jews, the whole race of them, as one collective body, *the ſon of perdition*: he has ranked them in one, as to moral character.

As to the limitarians, we have ſeen Dr. H. place them with the proudeſt of phariſees, who were the foremoſt to crucify Chriſt. Now as the limitarians, ſuch as hold to endleſs puniſhment, have made the main part of chriſtendom, ſo here we have *nearly* the whole of the Redeemer's kingdom, Jews and chriſtians, from Moſes down to this day, placed upon a level with Judas. Yea, as Dr. H. ſo reprobates all ſchemes but his own, we are obliged to take them *ſtrictly* the whole, marked out by him as one collective body, *the ſon of perdition*. This leads to the following inferences.

1. They muſt all ſuffer the ſame evils in this world as Judas did. This conſequence from Dr. H's reaſoning is undeniable. For he ſays, 'hell in an awful degree and the pains of it attend all 'ſin.'* 'A man is always miſerable in this world, in proportion 'to the degree of wickedneſs that governs him.'† Many other things he ſays to the ſame import. Therefore, as he charges the ſame wickedneſs upon the whole train of his opponents, eſpecially, as he does upon Judas, ſo he fairly argues them all to be as miſerable in this world, and conſtantly ſo, as Judas was when he ſuffered damnation in the higheſt ſenſe of the term.

2. They muſt all have the ſame degraded lot, or loweſt place in heaven, with Judas. For he ſays, 'all may be in heaven together 'in God's own time, brought there in his own way, with as great 'a diſtinction of reward *there*, as of character here.'‡ 'Their reward 'will be as different as their works have been.'§ Therefore, on Dr. H's plan, his opponents can have no higher reward, certainly, in the next world, than he has aſſigned to Judas.

* P. 234. † P. 197. ‡ P. 235. § P. 234.

3. His ranking his opponents, all that hold to eternal puniſhment, with the apoſtate Jews, even the crucifiers of Chriſt, and arguing them to be ſo miſerable in this world, and ſo degraded in the next, is proof of his great liberality and pure benevolence, he ſo often profeſſes. But,

4. His caſting ſuch contempt on the grace of God, and gracious exerciſes of heart, and being under neceſſity ſo to do, in order to make room for the deſpiſers of grace to be in the way to heaven, as well as true believers; who are ſo much governed by bigotry and ſpiritual pride, as he pretends; this one thing is ſufficient to make us wholly renounce his ſcheme. It was his duty to have diſtinguiſhed between ſpiritual pride and true love or holineſs. And ſhown how the latter is oppoſed to the former; and how believers need more grace daily, to overcome their pride, bigotry, and ſuperſtition. Inſtead of this, he would make the grace of God the occaſion of theſe abominable things. But that ſcheme which muſt needs caſt ſuch contempt on the power of divine grace in the hearts of men, cannot be right. It is ſaid to be common for univerſaliſt preachers to ridicule and mock thoſe gracious exerciſes, which diſtinguiſh ſaints from ſinners. And to brand all ſuch with bigotry, ſuperſtition, and hypocriſy, as profeſs repentance, faith, humility, and *a broken heart*, as a neceſſary preparation for death and the judgment. This daring, ungodly practice among thoſe preachers is enough to mark them out as *falſe teachers*, and to warn all men to *beware* of them, as they muſt anſwer it at *the great day*.

5. The evils ſuffered in this world by ſuch as hold to eternal miſery, whether Jews or chriſtians, can do no good on the Doctor's plan. He makes them all ſuffer with Judas, the height of damnation, without effecting any valuable end. But, paſſing the evils he tells of, we will come to ſuch as are real. And all that have been in the world from the beginning, can be of no uſe whatever, according to the Doctor's ſcheme. He ſays, 'all this glo-'ry and terror of divine holineſs and juſtice, we ſee, and forever 'ſhall ſee, in the ſufferings of the Son of God for ſinners. And there 'is no more need of the eternal damnation of any of the human 'race further to diſplay the glory of God's juſtice, and his holy 'anger againſt ſin; than there is need of the dim light of a candle, 'to help us to behold the face of the earth, when the ſun ſhines 'in the meridian.'* Thus he wholly contemns the ſufferings of mere men, even their eternal ſufferings, as beings ſuited to anſwer any of theſe purpoſes. It is like adding to the *finiſhed work* of the Son of God, or like ſuppoſing his work is not *finiſhed*, to imagine

* P. 169.

ine the ſufferings of mere creatures can do the leaſt good in this way. And God can lead men to repentance, ſo fit them for the ſame degree of happineſs in heaven, as well without their ſuffering evils in this world as with. Each of theſe things Dr. H. holds, as we have ſeen in the laſt Letter. Which is ſaying as plain as words can ſay, that all the evils ſuffered by men, in this life, are entirely uſeleſs. Now, this world, ever ſince Adam's tranſgreſſion, has been a ſcene of ſorrow, pain, and death. The LORD has alſo ſent on men great and awful judgments, from time to time. But all the judgments of heaven poured on men, here in time, from firſt to laſt, center in that great work of God on the apoſtate Jews; done in thoſe *days of vengeance* mentioned in Matt. xxiv. 21. 'Then ſhall be great tribulation, ſuch as 'was not ſince the beginning of the world to this time, no nor ever 'ſhall be.' Whoever reads the hiſtory of earthquakes, famine, peſtilence; treacheries, robberies, and aſſaſſinations; with the whole power of the Roman army, treading the Jews down as the mire of the ſtreet, and filling Jeruſalem and the neighbouring cities with blood, carnage, and death; whoever reads this, is at once ſtruck with that moſt awful prediction by Moſes: 'A fire 'is kindled in mine anger,' ſaith the LORD, 'and ſhall burn unto 'the loweſt hell. I will heap miſchiefs upon them, I will ſpend 'mine arrows upon them. They ſhall be burnt with hunger, and 'devoured with burning heat, and with bitter deſtruction.' According to the apoſtle, this was to diſplay both 'the goodneſs and 'ſeverity of God.'* To exhibit, throughout all ages, a ſtanding witneſs of his diſpleaſure at the ſin of the Jews in crucifying Chriſt; and to deſignate, moſt emphatically, the Saviour of men to a loſt world. But of all this Dr. H. can give no account. The judicial deſtruction or death of that vaſt multitude of Jews, with every attending evil, on his plan, can accompliſh no higher purpoſe, by bringing the character of God or man into view; communicate no more inſtruction, do no more good to the intelligent ſyſtem, than the ſlaughter of ſo many brute beaſts. So all the evils that ever have been, or will be, in this world, are in the ſame manner uſeleſs, on his plan.

When the chief magiſtrate inflicts puniſhment, ever ſo painful and of long continuance, on one or more of his ſubjects; which puniſhment ſo inflicted is, at the ſame time, ſuited to ſecure the peace and beſt good of the nation: this, inſtead of leſſening his honour and dignity, does directly eſtabliſh his character as an excellent ruler. But when a chief magiſtrate inflicts a ſlight puniſhment, and for a ſhort continuance, on ſome of his ſubjects; which

* Rom. ii. 22.

which puniſhment ſo inflicted is wholly for ſport or ſelf-gratification; this conduct does only call down upon him the indignation and abhorrence of the nation. Reaſon and common ſenſe revolt at ſuch conduct, viewing of it as the moſt ſavage barbarity. In this caſe, the ſafety and very exiſtence of the nation is ſtruck at. For this diſpoſition which will thus ſport in one inſtance, will alſo ſport with the lives and fortunes of the whole, when opportunity offers. So, for Dr. H. to argue that all the evils God has ſent into the world, and thoſe great and noted evils on the Jews, above mentioned; for him to argue theſe to be wholly uſeleſs, is caſting the utmoſt contempt on the divine character. Allowing theſe evils to be infinitely leſs than the endleſs torments of the damned, ſtill if God can inflict them for one day without doing any good, or for ſelf-gratification only, we have then no ſecurity left. God can then do the ſame, and for the ſame end, for two days, ten days, and forever. So that he is no longer to be truſted as a Being of infinite goodneſs, or as one diſpoſed to bring good to paſs by every thing he does. On the contrary, to hold that God invariably does good by all the evils he ſends on men in this world, and that he ſuits the everlaſting puniſhment of the damned for the beſt good of the redeemed, is directly pleading for the honour and dignity of his character. Eſpecially as he has ſo clearly revealed that part of mankind ſhall go away into everlaſting puniſhment.

6. The light of the goſpel, if the Doctor's words be true, can do no good in the world. When 'good diſtinctions,' and all the diſtinguiſhing things of the goſpel, *always* tend to ſpiritual pride, how can they ever do good? When Jews and Chriſtians, including the whole of the Redeemer's kingdom, have hitherto denied the Doctor's ſcheme, and been the proudeſt of phariſees, where is the benefit ariſing? Had they been heathen idolaters, as the Doctor pretends, they would have been 'all orthodox' in ſome points, and right in ſome meaſure. He would have the whole of them to be more vile and ignorant than the heathen, and that good diſtinctions or goſpel light and means have made them ſuch. So he would have them to be univerſally more miſerable here in time, and leſs happy in eternity, on account of theſe *good diſtinctions*. What is ſtill more extraordinary if poſſible, all the evil they ſuffer in this world brings no honour to God nor does it do good in any way whatever. Thus he makes the goſpel prove a ſore judgment, always ſo, inſtead of a bleſſing. As it proved to Judas; ſo it has to all men ſince Judas's day. Dr. H. has made the exception of not one man, in this caſe, as we have ſeen, before he comes to himſelf. And here we leave the Doctor for the preſent.

The

The goſpel is in itſelf the greateſt of bleſſings, however ſome men may abuſe it, be puniſhed for this abuſe, ſo the bleſſing eventually proves to them a curſe. The goſpel has a direct and powerful tendency to enlighten men, and lead them to repentance. The goſpel is the goſpel of ſalvation, it offers ſalvation to all men. And it is the only mean God ſees fit to improve for the ſalvation of men; or without this men univerſally periſh. Therefore, however men may deſpiſe it, this does not render it leſs good in itſelf; any more than deſpiſing heaven would alter or deſtroy the real happineſs of heaven. While men deſpiſe heaven, this is no heaven to them; but this does not alter the nature of heaven itſelf. So while men deſpiſe the goſpel, it is no good news to them; but this does not alter the real and everlaſting good the goſpel freely offers. Hence it is of the firſt importance to deſire the ſpread of the goſpel through the world, and that it might be attended with the ſanctifying power of the Holy Ghoſt. For this every benevolent mind will moſt heartily pray; leaving the event to be decided by divine wiſdom. At the ſame time, while many *deſpiſe, and wonder, and periſh* under the light of the goſpel, neither the Redeemer, nor the redeemed will eventually ſuſtain any loſs. 'Though Iſrael be not gathered, yet ſhall I be glorious in 'the eyes of the LORD, and my God ſhall be my ſtrength.' Iſai. xlix. 5.

I am, &c.

LETTER VI.

Dr. H's opinion that the Law and the Goſpel are in direct oppoſition to each other, examined, and compared to other things in his Book; alſo the abſurd and moſt ſhocking conſequences of this opinion.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

'THE voice of the whole law, and the voice of the goſpel,' the Doctor ſays, 'are exceedingly diſtinct, and diametrically oppoſite.'* He not only makes them oppoſite as to 'their ſubordinate effects, but 'oppoſite in their natures.'† Which is the ſame as holding the attributes of Deity to be at war with each other.

The moral law in itſelf conſidered, dooms ſinners to eternal perdition, without the leaſt proviſion for pardon, and whether they

* P. 43. † P. 61, 62.

they repent, or not. It goes upon the ground of ſtrict juſtice, inflicting judgment without mercy. While the goſpel makes full proviſion for ſinners to be pardoned. But this difference does not ſeem to expreſs a direct oppoſition. It appears more eligible to ſay, that the law and goſpel are in harmony; while the latter goes further than the former, gives *life* when the former cannot: and for the following reaſons. 1. There is nothing but perfection in the law. Its penalties or curſes are reaſonable, and ſuited to the publick good; as much ſo as its requirements and promiſes. The law is holy, and juſt, and good. It is eſſential to the ſecurity of the happineſs of all holy dependent beings. Herein it harmonizes with the goſpel. 2. The law and goſpel exactly agree in diſapproving of all ſin, and in expoſing the ſinfulneſs of ſin. 3. The law and goſpel pronounce the ſame ſentence of condemnation on impenitent ſinners, as ſuch. 4. They both agree in requiring perfect holineſs, or in requiring all men to love God with their whole mind and ſtrength, and their neighbour as themſelves. 5. Though the law makes no proviſion for the pardon of ſin, yet it perfectly approves of the proviſion made in the goſpel. 6. The law entirely agrees with the goſpel in the juſtification and ſalvation of every believer. 7. The law and the goſpel mutually illuſtrate the excellency and glory of each other; therefore they make a moſt glorious harmony. 8. Each of them ſerves to reveal the infinite love of God, and one as well as the other. It is allowed that the goſpel, in conjunction with the law, reveals that fulneſs of divine love, which the law alone could not do.

The objector cannot ſay that all this harmony is wholly by the death of Chriſt; and without this, the law in every ſenſe would have ſpoken quite the oppoſite, from what the law and goſpel now ſpeak in harmony. For it is plain that Chriſt died to magnify a law which was originally perfect throughout; elſe where is the exceeding glory of his death? Therefore, the original language of the law was the ſame as it now is; though now it approves of what the goſpel has done, which the law could not do.

How then could Dr. H. ſay, that the voice of the *whole* law, and the voice of the goſpel, are exceedingly diſtinct, and diametrically oppoſite? And he goes on to ſay, 'they are even op-'poſite in their natures—as diſtinct in their natures as any two 'things in the univerſe.'* He ſtrongly intimates that the attributes of Deity, *juſtice* and *mercy*, were originally at war with each other; and that Chriſt died to reconcile this jar or war in the

* P. 42.

the divine mind, ſo to effect the ſalvation of all men. Whereas it is certain that divine juſtice is as holy as divine mercy, and a branch of the ſame infinite love. Divine mercy goes further than divine juſtice, in ſhowing love to his enemies. But juſtice perfectly approves of the means whereby love is ſhown to his enemies, and perfectly approves of this love; even rejoices in it as much as mercy does, as ſoon as wiſdom has found out the way. Beſide, there is no glory in mercy only when juſtice is maintained. So that divine juſtice is, eternally and unalterably as amiable and glorious as divine mercy.—Theſe things being premiſed, we are prepared to make ſome *obſervations*, which will bring the Doctor's ſcheme into view.

I. He maintains that the curſe of the law is wholly done away in Chriſt. As we have ſeen, 'The law,' ſays he, 'ſpeaks in 'righteouſneſs; every where denounces what is *juſt* and *equal* 'towards man. It thunders aloud the true deſert of man. But 'it ſpeaks not what ſhall *in fact* take place on man,—any other-'wiſe than in his ſurety.'* And that moſt awful threatening to Judas, in Matt. xxvi. 24, he ſays was 'only as one of the many 'awful denunciations we have of the voice of juſtice, all ſilenc-'ed and ſatisfied in the great ſurety.'† Again, he ſays, 'God 'hath nothing, *nothing at all*, againſt any ſinner, in the world, 'to effect his final condemnation;—all he ever had againſt them, 'was fully ſatisfied by their ſurety.'‡ Theſe paſſages, and others we have ſeen, make it plain that the Doctor holds the curſe of the law to be wholly ſet aſide, both as to believers and unbelievers. All the evils of every kind threatened in the law, and ſpoken to ſinners, to *any ſinner in the world*, point directly to Chriſt, and are laid on him, 'ſilenced and ſatisfied in him.' The Doctor alſo holds, as has been ſhown, that 'all the ſorrow, pain, 'and puniſhment, ſpoken of in the goſpel, comes on Jeſus Chriſt, 'God-man. But, as to any mere man, the goſpel ſays not one 'uncomfortable word.' This leads to the following things.

1. If all the evils threatened both in the law and the goſpel come on Chriſt, point directly to his ſufferings and death, where is the oppoſition between the law and the goſpel? Or how can they be *wholly* in oppoſition to each other? They certainly agree, allowing the Doctor's ſtatement, in one moſt important article.

2. The Doctor's idea of entire oppoſition between law and goſpel, muſt intend one of theſe things: Either firſt, the goſpel meets the oppoſition of the law, and overcomes it by ſuperior force, and then ſpeaks good to men, proportionate to its overbalancing

* P. 35. † P. 289. ‡ P. 61.

ancing power: Or ſecondly, the goſpel wholly ſilences the law, retains afterwards all its good to men, and ſpeaks with its whole ſtrength of goodneſs. But in either of theſe caſes, the curſe of the law is a mere empty name. Then where is the oppoſition? What can the goſpel find in the law, to oppoſe, after all the curſes of the latter are ſilenced? And if juſtice be that which ought to take place, but never will, how does it counteract the *voice of fact*, which Dr. H. calls the goſpel?

3. On this plan, what proviſion do we find for the puniſhment of tranſgreſſors? Even under a diſpenſation of grace, we find nothing but a bare threatening; a threatened evil which is a mere empty ſound: And that for the vileſt of tranſgreſſors, ſuch as trample under foot the blood of the Son of God, and do deſpite to the *Spirit of grace!*

4. If 'God has nothing at all againſt any ſinner in the world, 'to effect his final condemnation; if all he ever had againſt them 'was fully ſatisfied by their ſurety;' what propriety is there in calling on ſinners to repent, that they might eſcape hell? Certainly, according to theſe words of the Doctor, there is no hell for the ungodly. God has *nothing at all* againſt them, all he *ever had* againſt them was wholly ſatisfied or done away, by Chriſt their ſurety. There is, therefore, no vengeance in ſtore, no everlaſting fire, but all has been laid on Chriſt, and in ſuch manner as there is none left for wicked men. On this plan, how could Dr. H. call on ſinners to repent, that they might eſcape everlaſting fire?

Dr. H. would object and ſay, 'all ſin is even death, hell, and 'damnation, ſo long as the ſoul continues impenitent.'* But this is only a mere cavil; it is *eternal* damnation we are here ſpeaking of, and which the Doctor warns ſinners againſt.—Dr. H. would ſay again, 'a man is always miſerable in proportion to the 'degree of wickedneſs that governs him.'† Therefore, it is neceſſary to turn from ſin, as the only way to eſcape miſery and damnation. But, to ſay a man is always thus miſerable, is to aſſert a ſelf evident falſehood. For, when he is thrown alive into a furnace of fire, is his miſery then increaſed or decreaſed, juſt as he may increaſe or decreaſe in wickedneſs? The matter is too ſerious to be cavilled with. It is of infinite concern for us to know, whether God has prepared eternal puniſhments for ſuch as deſpiſe his Son, or whether he has not. Dr. H. declares he has not, and in the ſtrongeſt terms. He repeats the words: God has *nothing, nothing at all* againſt *any ſinner* in the world. Whether they are penitent or impenitent, he makes no difference; hell is

* P. 316. † P. 234

is totally annihilated, as to all mankind. All God ever had againſt them, any of them, or all of them, is fully ſatisfied in their ſurety. What words could be ſtronger?

Now, how could Dr. H. have the effrontery to warn ſinners to eſcape hell by repentance? He has interſperſed his book with ſuch language as this: 'The wrath of God abideth on us, unleſs 'we are united to Chriſt by regeneration and ſaving faith; and 'except we repent we ſhall all aſſuredly periſh.'* By 'periſh,' and by 'the wrath of God,' he ſays he here intends the ſame as thoſe do 'who are called orthodox,' and the ſame as '*Calvin*' intended by theſe words. Which was to periſh everlaſtingly, or to abide that *wrath* which fixes the finally impenitent in endleſs death. The fact is, the Doctor choſe to keep up a falſe ſhow, or an appearance of truth. Whereas, he ought to have told ſinners honeſtly, that, on his plan, their ſins did not expoſe them, in the leaſt, to future puniſhment; and whether they repented, or not.

5. If 'the voice of juſtice is wholly ſilenced,' then the diſhonour done to God is fully repaired. But that vengeance which cries after the honour of God is fully repaired, muſt be cruelty, or unjuſt vengeance. And Dr. H. ſays, 'The law demands 'perfection; curſes for want of it; and cries vengeance.'† He here means divine vengeance. But how does this cry after it is *wholly* ſilenced, and the honour of God completely reſtored? To paſs this contradiction, for the preſent.—'The law curſes all 'human nature,' believers and unbelievers alike; and cries vengeance in heaven, as well as on earth. That this is his meaning, will hereafter appear. By theſe curſes, therefore, by this vengeance, if the Doctor intends any thing more than an unmeaning ſound, he muſt acknowledge the attributes of Deity to be oppoſite in their natures, or at war with each other. That vengeance in God which cries againſt his mercy, which cries againſt his own honour, or cries after his honour is fully vindicated and *ſatisfied;* and thus cries againſt all men; muſt be only a diſcordant oppoſition to his mercy. It muſt be a vengeance in its nature unreaſonable, unjuſt, or averſe to that which is good. And Dr. H. has ſaid that the law and the goſpel, which are expreſſive of divine juſtice and mercy, 'are even oppoſite in their 'natures, as diſtinct in their natures as any two things in the u'niverſe.' But that vengeance which cries after the honour of God is fully vindicated, muſt be oppoſite in its nature, not only to divine mercy, but to divine juſtice alſo; it muſt be cruelty.

* P. 172. † P. 43.

It will here be ſaid, the Doctor has been miſtaken. He maintains the law to be holy, juſt, and good: the juſtice of God to be moſt amiable and glorious: that juſtice cries, and cries continually for the death of ſinners, but the death of Chriſt prevents this awful event: that juſtice accepts the death of Chriſt in the room of the endleſs death of ſinners.

It is granted that the Doctor ſays all this. He alſo ſays that the death of Chriſt has ſo far *magnified the law*, neither the juſtice nor honour of God has any further demand on ſinners, as to penalty or ſuffering, and whether they live in rebellion againſt him or not. 'To imagine there is any need of the *eternal perſonal torment* of any ſinner of the human race,' ſays he, 'in order further to illuſtrate the holineſs and juſtice of God; or further to impreſs the minds of the intelligent ſyſtem with a ſenſe of the infinite odiouſneſs of ſin, and the infinite purity of God, and his infinite hatred of all ſin, is plainly to ſuppoſe that the great work of the Son of God can admit of ſome amendment. For any man to think this neceſſary or expedient, or any ſuch thing, is an amazing reflection on him (Jeſus Chriſt).'* Thus he deſpiſes the ſuppoſition that the ſufferings of ſinners can do any thing toward illuſtrating the juſtice of God, or anſwer any of the above ends; as he would deſpiſe an attempt to add to that work Chriſt finiſhed on the croſs. And it is remarkable, the Doctor ſays this not with reference to the ſufferings of penitent believing ſinners only, but, in his own words, 'of any ſinner of the human race.' What demand then has juſtice, or this *vengeance* Dr. H. tells of, on ſinners? Certainly no good demand: for none of the above good ends can be anſwered by its being executed upon them. In another place Dr. H. ſays, 'you derogate from this glory,' the glory of God, 'in juſt proportion, as you hold, that any number of the mere human race ſhall be perſonally damned, be that number more or leſs.'* What then does this vengeance cry for? And what can be the nature of this vengeance, which cries againſt the good of all mankind, and againſt the glory of God? If it be any thing more than a ſolemn empty ſound, it muſt be a cruel unrelenting rage.

The truth of the caſe appears to be this: Dr. H. makes a mighty ſhow of the curſe of the law, of vengeance, and of awful terror; then, to have us believe it never will be executed, he applies it to all men alike, whether friends or enemies to Chriſt, and whether they be on earth or in heaven. Every one ſees how the inhabitants of heaven are ſecure from the *curſe*, and that it will not come on believers, who are here in the body. But hardened

* P. 263.

dened ſinners, who put darkneſs for light, will be diſpoſed to flatter themſelves that the law ſpeaks but one language, to believers and unbelievers, to all mankind the ſame. And they will vainly think it will not be executed on one child of Adam, becauſe it will not on believers. Hence they will be in danger of fixing themſelves down in the moſt fatal ſecurity.

After all it will be objected, Although the death of Chriſt meets the cry of juſtice, and ſatisfies every demand it has againſt all men, yet as juſtice is juſtice, an unchangeable attribute of Deity, if ever it cried, it muſt ſtill cry and cry forever to ſhow what men deſerve.

Anſwer. If juſtice is an unchangeable attribute of Deity, it is unchangeably right. When it has a real demand, it will make this demand. When it has no demand, it will be ſure to make none. And after its demands are all ſatisfied, it will expreſs itſelf ſatisfied, inſtead of crying for more. The nature and direct tendency of juſtice is to make reparation to the injury done to divine honour, and to ſecure the happineſs of all holy beings. But to ſuppoſe juſtice can go any further, or cry after this is done, is an abſurdity. And, although the full deſert of all men will forever be kept in view, yet not by an impending evil, or threatened puniſhment; that is, to thoſe for whom juſtice is completely ſatisfied. 'There is therefore now no condemnation 'to them which are in Chriſt Jeſus, who walk not after the fleſh, 'but after the Spirit.'* 'Againſt ſuch there is no law,'† or no *curſe*. Therefore, to apply the curſe of the law to all men alike, whether believers or unbelievers, as the Doctor does, is a groſs perverſion of the truth. This leads to *obſerve*,

II. One main article in the Doctor's ſcheme of law and goſpel, is, 'That theſe two capital points are, throughout the whole 'bible, kept in conſtant view, *running ſide by ſide*, in open 'ſight, from the beginning to the cloſe of the ſacred oracles. 'Theſe points are very different from each other, yea directly 'oppoſite, except only as harmonizing in Chriſt.'‡—But where is the harmony, when juſtice cries after it is ſatisfied, as we have juſt ſeen? The object, however, is to ſhow, that the Doctor holds the voice of law or juſtice, to all characters of men, and whether they be in heaven or earth, to be uniformly the ſame, and, of courſe, to produce the ſame effects upon them.—'Yea, I ſay further,' he adds, 'that the ſame thing will be kept in view in 'heaven to all eternity.'§—'Striking diſplays of *pure juſtice*, 'the ſanction of law in awful terror. Such diſplays will remain 'forever, as I have ſaid before, in the full view of all the ſaints 'in

* Rom. 8. 1. † Gal. 5. 23. ‡ P. 26, 27. § P. 62.

'in heaven to all eternity. In the glaſs of pure juſtice, they 'will forever ſee themſelves lifting up their eyes in torments. 'Though in their ſurety, they ſhall find the bread and ſure wat-'ers of eternal conſolation.'* The 'diſplays of *pure juſtice*,' here on earth, the Doctor has told us what theſe are; as in his account of Judas. That threatening to Judas, 'Good were it 'for that man if he had never been born,'† he ſays was inflicted on him here in time. And this he ſays, 'Might be underſtood, 'only as one of the many awful denunciations we have of the 'voice of juſtice.' Thus, the diſplay of juſtice here on earth, in the Doctor's ſenſe. And 'the ſame thing,' he ſays, 'will be 'kept in view in heaven to all eternity.' Which muſt produce the ſame effects in both caſes.

The Doctor often advances the ſame thing. Showing how the apoſtles preached the goſpel, he ſays, 'They, every where, '*mixed in the law;* and *this* again made no diſtinction (be-'tween ſaints and ſinners): For every word of it damned the 'preacher, and all his hearers. It condemned every thing ſhort 'of abſolute perfection. With one juſt and awful voice, it al-'ways damned all *human nature.*' If the law makes no diſtinction between ſaints and ſinners, if it damns the preacher, one of the apoſtles, and damns all human nature, then whatever this damnation is, it is the ſame both in heaven and in earth. Beſides, if the ſame thing will be kept in view in heaven, 'the ſanc-'tion of law in awful terror,' to all eternity; then the damnation Judas ſuffered, here on earth, illuſtrates that ſanction of law *in awful terror*, in heaven. But this damnation of Judas, Dr. H. ſays was 'awful anguiſh and utter deſpair.' Which decides the meaning of his words, 'the ſanction of law in awful terror,' applied to the inhabitants of heaven. The Doctor would allow no ſuch thing; but he has ſo connected his arguments, and uſed ſuch expreſſions, as to make heaven appear to be a place of *awful anguiſh and utter deſpair!*

It will now be objected, What Judas ſuffered cannot illuſtrate the diſplay of juſtice, in heaven; for where there is abſolute perfection, there can be no perſonal ſufferings. And Dr. H. has ſaid, 'The law condemned every thing ſhort of abſolute 'perfection;' which implies a reſerve of the ſaints in heaven.

It is granted he has ſaid this; but ſays, in the next words, 'It always damned *all human nature.*' Therefore, if this damnation Judas ſuffered was 'one of the many awful denunciations 'of juſtice,' then the ſame 'denunciation' in heaven, on all human nature, muſt produce the ſame kind of anguiſh and deſpair in

* P. 190, 191. † Mark 14. 21.

in every human ſoul, in heaven. Dr. H. has given no notice that he means any thing different by the word *damnation*, in one place, from what he does in another. Furthermore, how can the word, *damnation*, be only an empty ſound, or mean no perſonal ſufferings, in heaven, while on earth it means moſt aggravated ſufferings of both body and mind; and the law and goſpel ſtill in oppoſition, running ſide by ſide throughout the bible? And how can the ſame thing be kept up in heaven to all eternity? If the diſplay of pure juſtice, in heaven, produce no ſufferings there, certainly it is not *the ſame thing*. If the awful denunciation of juſtice, here on earth, carries in it the greateſt poſſible miſery, inflicted on Judas, and this miſery on him be neceſſary to this denunciation of juſtice; certainly that which carries in it no miſery at all, in heaven, *is not one of the many awful denunciations of juſtice.*

Dr. H. would here ſay, The ſame thing that is the *cauſe* of complete miſery, on earth, is the cauſe of complete happineſs in heaven. But it is not the *cauſe*, it is the thing itſelf we are contending. And he muſt grant the word, *damnation*, always means 'excluſion from divine mercy, or condemnation to eternal puniſhment.'* He muſt grant that ſtriking diſplays of pure juſtice, or the ſanction of law in awful terror, always carry the idea of an object, a rational being, either devoted, or actually ſubjected, to complete miſery. If he intended, however, wholly to change the ſenſe of words, he ought to have given notice of it.

He will ſay again, 'All is ſilenced and ſatisfied in the great 'ſurety.' In Chriſt may be ſeen thoſe diſplays of juſtice, awful terror, &c. But, if this be the caſe, how is it that Judas ſuffered in the higheſt degree? And how is the ſame thing to take place in heaven, to eternity?—Thus far is Dr. H. driven. He muſt either grant his voice of terror, of vengeance, &c. to be only a ſound, or he muſt ſhow us the heaven he tells of, where Judas now is, to be a place of complete torment. Either of which overthrows his ſcheme. As to the latter, the caſe is decided. As to the former, an empty ſound of *terror* can oppoſe nothing. And he ſays, 'I readily grant, if this diſtinction,' or oppoſition, 'between the diſplay of law and that of goſpel, running through the whole word of God, is without foundation, my whole argument falls to the ground;'† meaning, that his whole ſcheme comes to nought.

But Dr. H. gives us the following remarkable expreſſions. 'This doctrine of ſaving, univerſal grace, *is perfectly conſiſtent with the moſt plain and poſitive declarations of the word of God,*

* See Johnſon's Dictionary. † P. 191.

'*God, that the pains of hell ſhall be endleſs; and that the wicked ſhall go away into everlaſting puniſhment, in all the boundleſs extent of theſe words, and many others that convey the ſame idea of the endleſs puniſhment of ſinners, and that in the plaineſt poſſible manner of expreſſion.* In their '*Surety*, *Vicar*, or *Subſtitute*, i. e. in Chriſt, *the head of every man*, they go away into *everlaſting puniſhment*, in a true goſpel ſenſe. In him they ſuffer infinite puniſhment, i. e. he ſuffers for them, in their room and ſtead.'* In ſeveral other places, he attempts to ſhow how this everlaſting puniſhment is the conſummation of their everlaſting happineſs. Thus, with one ſtroke, would he daſh out all the threatenings of God's word, all the *curſes* written againſt the wicked, from the beginning to the cloſe of the ſacred volume; making them centre wholly in Chriſt, and ſatisfied in him. But he muſt here abide the conſequence. As,

1. All the dreadful *curſes* in the bible, denounced againſt *the wicked*, which look forward to the day of judgment, and to eternity, are, in his ſenſe, ſo many aſſured pledges of their everlaſting happineſs.

2. Thoſe who perſevere in the moſt daring rebellion againſt Chriſt, openly reviling and mocking his offered mercy, the more repeated and aggravated the threatened curſes are to them, the ſtronger aſſurances have they of happineſs, and the moſt exalted ſtate of happineſs, in the coming world. But why ſhould Dr. H. boaſt of his offering new light to the world; the prince of darkneſs has preached the ſame doctrine, many ages ago.

3. When the prophets tremble at the woes they denounce on the ungodly; when the apoſtle Paul has 'great heavineſs and 'continual ſorrow of heart,' at the awful apprehenſion of what he foreſees coming on the apoſtate Jews; at theſe things Dr. H. would rejoice. For, in his ſenſe, when theſe things are fulfilled on theſe deſpiſers of grace, their heaven is complete.

4. The Doctor muſt now deny all that ſad detail he has given of the ſufferings of Judas. Or the evil things he has related of him, in a myſtick ſenſe, he muſt now call them good things. The pains of hell, with Dr. H, are the joys of heaven. And when Judas had arrived to the height of damnation, as he ſays he did, then was his happineſs completed.

Thus, by the way, the impoſſibility of knowing what the Doctor means. In one place, he calls hell the ſeat of torment; in another, a myſtick heaven. At one time, he would have everlaſting puniſhment and everlaſting happineſs both the ſame; at another,

* P. 164.

another, he calls everlaſting puniſhment or damnation, 'awful 'anguiſh and utter deſpair.' Again, 'The wicked ſhall go away,' &c. that is, *The wicked ſhall go away into everlaſting happineſs!* In another place, he ſays, '*No unclean thing* ſhall enter 'there.' At the ſame time, he has given no notice of his inverting the meaning of words. But, by ſaying, In heaven Chriſt ſuffers for them, in their room and ſtead; by this he can find no relief, till he has eraſed out of his book all the evils or ſufferings, he has related of Judas.

5. All the ſolemn warnings he has given to the wicked, to awaken them, and to arouſe them to an eſcape from hell, by repentance, he muſt alſo blot entirely out of his book. The pains of hell, he now calls the joys of heaven. But,

6. The moſt remarkable conſequence from the above premiſes is this: The evils of every kind, throughout the bible, threatened to wicked men, or though wicked men be named in them, are, nevertheleſs, aimed wholly at Chriſt.—'In Chriſt, the head 'of every man, they go away into everlaſting puniſhment. In 'him they ſuffer infinite puniſhment, i. e. he ſuffers for them, in 'their room and ſtead.' Thus, every diſtreſs, pain, ſorrow, puniſhment, miſery, torment, or death; temporal or eternal; all the evil, from the beginning to the end of the bible, threatened to the wicked, or rather named to them, is aimed directly at Chriſt, and comes wholly on him; while men univerſally eſcape. 'In their room and ſtead,' Chriſt ſuffers every threatened evil for them; this is the conſequence of the Doctor's reaſoning. 'The goſpel tells,' he ſays, 'what the ſon of God deſerves,' and 'the law damns even the human nature of the Son of God, in a 'way of ſuretiſhip.'* What the law ſpeaks alſo, is never to 'take 'place *on man at all*, any otherwiſe than in his ſurety.'† And 'the goſpel ſpeaks not one uncomfortable word to any *mere* '*creature*.'‡ He therefore makes the law and the goſpel, or the whole word of God, to be one continued hiſtory of the ſufferings of Chriſt only.

But, is it poſſible for Dr. H. to believe his own words? If ſo, then muſt he apply to Chriſt what was propheſied of Ahithophel and Judas.—'*Add iniquity unto their iniquity; and let them* '*not come into thy righteouſneſs*. Let them be blotted out of 'the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous.'§ 'Let there be none to extend mercy unto him. As he loved curſ-'ſing, ſo let it come unto him; as he delighted not in bleſſing, ſo let 'it be far from him. As he clothed himſelf with curſing as with 'a garment, ſo let it come into his bowels like water, and like oil

'into

* P. 32, 63. † P. 35. ‡ P. 43. § Pſal. 69. 27, 28.

'into his bones. Let his days be few; and let another take his 'office. Let his children be fatherleſs, and his wife a widow. 'Let this be *the reward* of mine adverſaries from the LORD, and 'of them that ſpeak evil againſt my ſoul:'* *The reward* of Chriſt himſelf, in Dr. H's language. So what was foretold of the idolatrous Iſraelites 'They ſhall paſs through it, hardly beſtead and 'hungry: and it ſhall come to paſs, that, when they ſhall be hungry, they ſhall fret themſelves, and curſe their King and their 'God, and look upward. And they ſhall look unto the earth; 'and, behold, trouble and darkneſs, dimneſs of anguiſh; and they 'ſhall be driven to darkneſs.'† Again, that irrevocable threatening to the blaſphemer againſt the Holy Ghoſt: 'It ſhall not 'be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to 'come.'‡ Dr. H. muſt apply to Chriſt himſelf!—We ſhall ſee more on this ſubject, in our next Letter.

I am, &c.

LETTER VII.

Dr. H's opinion of law and goſpel, continued.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

WE ſhall again obſerve,

III. More particularly on what has been often brought into view. And, in contradiction to all Dr. H. has ſaid, as to the curſe of the law being done away, ſeveral of his leading doctrines argue it to be ſtill in full force.—'Judas indeed met with an 'awful and aggravated damnation, in the higheſt ſenſe of the 'term, in the true ſcripture meaning of it, as it relates to any 'mere man perſonally. What this damnation or perdition was, 'I have before ſhown.'§ The Doctor had before ſhown, as we have ſeen, this damnation to have been endured in this world; and this is the only exception he has made, when applying the word, *damnation*, to the ſufferings of Judas. Confining of it to this life only, and we muſt, of courſe, in every other view underſtand it according to its conſtant meaning; which, in every paſt age, has ſignified complete miſery, and that according to the full deſert of the perſon thus ſuffering damnation. Should it here be objected, that it was impoſſible for Judas to have ſuffered, although his ſufferings were complete, the full deſert of his ſins, in ſuch a ſhort ſpace of time, or in any limited term; then the

* Pſal. 109. 8, 9. &c. † Iſai. 8. 21, 22. ‡ Matt. 12. 32. § P. 262.

the queſtion is, why has Dr. H. uſed the word, *damnation*, in this inſtance? He muſt be anſwerable for his own miſuſe of words. This word, *damnation*, he has uſed; which has ever been received to import a complete execution of the curſe of the law, anſwerable to the ill deſert of the perſon thus curſed. And he has given us no notice that he deſigned any thing by the word, leſs or more, than its eſtabliſhed ſignification; that is, in his application of it to Judas, excepting his reſtriction of it to this life. And we here ſee the accurate relation he has given us of the 'ſon of 'perdition;' not only that he 'met with an awful and aggravated 'damnation, in the higheſt ſenſe of the term, but in the true ſcrip-'ture meaning of it, as it relates to any mere man perſonally.' Now 'the moral law,' Dr. H. ſays, 'every where ſpeaks to man 'in his own perſonal character; the goſpel in that of the Meſſi-'ah.'* 'What is juſt and right for God to do with us, conſider-'ed in our perſonal character, and deſert. This I ſhall call the 'pure voice of juſtice to man, without regard to an atonement or 'a mediator.'† Therefore, granting the goſpel ever to ſpeak in the character of the Meſſiah, and to ſpeak nothing but good to man, as Dr. H. ſays; then it muſt have been the law, in its full ſtrength, which took hold of Judas, and inflicted this curſe upon him: he being conſidered in his own perſonal character and deſert; and without regard to an atonement, or a mediator. Unleſs the law had thus taken hold of him, how could he have ſuffered as he did? It was not by virtue of the goſpel, for this Dr. H. ſays contains *no* evil thing to man. It muſt of courſe have been the law, the pure voice of juſtice, executing its curſe on Judas, equal to his deſert. And the Doctor employs the moſt pertinent words, and almoſt every word, generally uſed to ſignify the curſe of the law; inflicted on the ſinner proportionate to his deſert. 'Judas,' he ſays, 'was a notable ſon of perdition, ſignally ſo; 'a moſt miſerable, loſt, condemned ſinner; in awful anguiſh, and 'utter deſpair;' and many other ſimilar words. And Judas's *damnation*, which has ever been underſtood to be the curſe of the law, he has ſummed up in the ſuperlative degree. Thus, the Doctor's arguing goes to prove that Judas ſuffered, in perſon, and according to his perſonal deſert, the full weight of the curſe of the law. This is to prove the curſe of the law to be ſtill in full force againſt impenitent ſinners. Or that it was in full force ll gainſt one impenitent ſinner, and has been executed upon him a.

To the ſame import the Doctor has theſe expreſſions.—'A m 'is always miſerable in proportion to the degree of wickedn an 'that governs him.'‡—'Hence we ſee how fit it is, that all ers

* P. 32. † P. 26. ‡ P. 234.

'ſhould be attended, or rebuked with pain and ſorrow, which 'never fails to be the caſe.'*—'Men ought indeed, to be deter-'red from ſin by fear of hell: For hell in an awful degree, and 'the pains of it, attend all ſin.'† As if a man had need be *de-terred* from the ſword, or warned to eſcape it, while it is now piercing him through! For he here makes ſin, and the pains of hell, keep pace together; and the ſinner to have no greater miſ-cry to fear than what he now feels. He makes a great and ſol-emn outcry, concerning the ſword of divine vengeance, that it is juſt ready to overtake ſinners; then tells them it is nothing but what they now feel. But, by theſe expreſſions, he determines the curſe of the law to be ſtill in force againſt impenitent ſinners. For this awful degree of the pains of hell, which he ſays attends all ſin, has been always underſtood to mean the curſe of the law. So, if 'a man is always miſerable in proportion to the degree of 'wickedneſs that governs him,' then is he always puniſhed in proportion to his deſert; than which the curſe of the law can ex-tend no further.

The Doctor ſays again, 'The hell that the devils are in, and 'that all mankind deſerve, and are condemned to, by the law of 'God, is nothing but perfection of ſin, with its inſeperable con-'nections and conſequences.'‡ This, with other things, he ſays, makes out three arguments, either of which proves the curſe of the law to be in force againſt the diſobedient, and that it is always executed upon them. As,

1. By theſe 'inſeperable connections and conſequences,' the Doctor perhaps means a guilty conſcience, with ſome other at-tendant evils. But whatever theſe evils be, they muſt be inſtan-taneous evils. For, if the ſinner have not received the full re-ward of his iniquity, as faſt as he goes along, and this reward, or theſe evils which attend his iniquity be inſeperable connections and conſequences of it, and remaining yet to be inflicted upon him in ſome future time, then how is it poſſible for him to eſ-cape, immediately, the deſert of his iniquity, or the evils attend-ing it, by becoming holy? If the evils connected with ſin re-main for the leaſt ſpace of time, after they become due, to be inflicted on the ſinner, it is certain he cannot eſcape them imme-diately, by becoming holy. But, whether the ſinner receives the evils connected with his ſin as faſt as he paſſes along, or whether he receives them in ſome future time, yet, in either caſe, he is certain to receive them; provided they be inſeperable connec-tions and conſequences, as Dr. H. aſſerts them to be. As he often ſays, however, that ſinners immediately eſcape all the evils of

* P. 294. † P. 197. ‡ P. 238.

of sin, by turning from it, it follows, allowing these inseparable connections and consequences, that they receive the utmost of their desert of sin as fast as they go along; so as nothing afterward remains to be inflicted upon them, further than as they again commit sin. Therefore, Dr. H. has not only given us his opinion of 'the hell that all mankind deserve, and are condemned 'to, by the law of God,' but he has very strongly argued that all mankind do indeed suffer the pains of this hell, proportionate to their desert, and the degrees of wickedness that govern them; and that they suffer these pains of hell as fast as they have merited them; so that no part remains afterwards due to them, not even for the shortest space of time. This as clearly decides the curse of the divine law to be in full force, as though the Doctor had expressed it in direct terms.

2. This *hell*, he says, which 'is nothing but the perfection of 'sin, is the hell that the devils are in.' By which he argues, as far as men have arrived to the perfection of sin, so far they endure the same sufferings, and are in the same hell as the devils are. And 'fallen men,' he says, 'became as bad as fallen angels, at 'their first apostacy, according to their capacity,'* He has also made his opponents as bad in a moral view as devils: they join, he says, with satan in all he does. So he fixes all wicked men, especially his opponents, with devils, in one and the same hell: they having come to the same perfection of sin with devils. And he says he has 'the self same idea of the nature of the misery of 'hell, as *Calvin* had.'† Calvin held, it is well known, that hell, the hell prepared for devils, was a place of the utmost torment, where the curse of the law is completely executed.

3. Dr. H. says, 'We know of no saviour provided for them '(the devils), or that ever will be.—There is not the least intima-'tion of grace in hell.'‡ In the same connection he describes devils as suffering 'long continued anguish and pain, and the ut-'most torment;' and that the personal suffering of devils bespeaks 'the pure voice of justice.' This, as plainly as words can, argues that the devils suffer the utmost of the curse of God's law, or exactly according to their desert. As Dr. H. fixes wicked men in the same hell with devils, so he makes them suffer the same curse, and the utmost of the curse.

And whether devils receive their full wages of sin as fast as they go along, or not, yet the Doctor has decidedly shown that fallen men receive the full desert of their sin, *all its inseperable connections and consequences*, in such manner as not one mite remains due to them, not even for a moment of time. Is it possible

* P. 144. † P. 172, 173. ‡ P. 207.

sible for the craft and cunning of satan to devise a hell better suited to gratify carnal hearts than this? *Hell nothing but perfection of sin, with its inseperable connections and consequences!* and sinners told to believe they have already suffered the utmost, yea all their sins deserve; the Doctor, however, cannot claim the honour of being the author of it; the same kind of doctrine was delivered by the *serpent*, in the garden of Eden, almost six thousand years ago.

The Doctor's '*system of real grace*, issuing in the salvation 'of all men,'* is now at an end. If his own arguments be admitted, not one of the human kind can ever be saved by *grace*. They cannot be saved from the curse of the law by grace, for every one suffers the curse as fast as he merits it. How is it possible for men to be saved from the curse, when they have already endured it, proportionate to their desert? How is it possible for men to be saved from hell, when they have already endured all the hell their sin deserves?—when hell and sin are inseperable? And on this ground men cannot be forgiven, for they have nothing to be forgiven of; they have already suffered all the demand justice had against them, so that nothing remains to be forgiven. The man that constantly pays for all he receives, wherever he has commerce, can have no debt lying against him; but is upon even scores with all men, or no just charge ever could have been made against him. Therefore, none of his fellow men could, by an act of grace, relinquish a debt to him; for no one has any against him. On Dr. H's plan, sinners keep even with divine justice; they suffer momentarily, not the least particle of time behind, so as to satisfy all the demand justice has upon them: hence the impossibility of their being forgiven. How is it possible for them to be forgiven, when there is nothing due from them, and nothing to be forgiven? How is it possible for grace to interpose, and relinquish a demand justice has against them, when justice has no demand against them? But what could more exactly agree with the corrupt desires of wicked men, than for them to be told they are even with divine justice? That the hell they suffer, in this world, is coequal with every demand against them! This sentiment, however, lies at the bottom of *universalism*. And shows this scheme to be agreeable to the perverse feelings of all *natural men*.

On this ground also, sinners cannot, with propriety, be called on to repent, and confess their sins before God. They have suffered all they deserve, they have no debt lying against them, therefore have nothing to confess. Neither is there need of their repenting,

* Title page.

repenting, in order to eſcape the evil due to them for their ſin; for no evil ever remains due to them for their ſin.

Again, on Dr. H's ground, ſhould ſinners become perfectly holy, they would be entitled to heaven and happineſs, on the covenant of works. They have already ſuffered 'the pains of 'hell in an awful degree,' and ſuffered all they deſerve; of courſe, have atoned for their ſins, as faſt as they have committed them. Therefore, ſhould they become perfectly holy, they would ſtand on the ſame footing as though they had never ſinned. A ſubject that has injured his prince, at the ſame time, by fine, impriſonment, or ſome other way, has made amends, as the law demands; provided he now becomes an obedient ſubject, he can claim of his prince, by the rules of juſtice, the protection of his intereſt and perſonal happineſs, in the ſame manner as though he had done nothing amiſs. So, if ſinners make amends, by their own ſufferings, for their violations of God's law, as Dr. H. argues they do, they muſt then, whenever they become perfectly holy, be completely reſtored to divine favour, by their own merit. Their ſins, as theſe are all atoned for by their own meritorious ſufferings, muſt be entirely forgotten. And as they are now perfectly obedient, they muſt be entitled to the ſame perſonal reward, as if they now began to exiſt in a ſtate of perfect obedience.

Furthermore, ſuppoſe ſinners turn from ſin, and become holy only in part, as is indeed the caſe; ſtill, if we admit Dr. H's arguments, they are then juſtified by works, and not by grace. Suppoſe the imperfect believer to have two degrees of ſin, and three degrees of holineſs; as his ſuffering, his 'hell,' Dr. H. tells of, ſatisfies for his two degrees of ſin, his three degrees of holineſs muſt be meritorious in point of law, in the ſame ſort as if he were wholly free from ſin, and wholly free from ſuffering. And this will hold as to any proportion of ſin and holineſs.

The *hell*, the Doctor has introduced into this world; the miſery of men, which is always as the degree of wickedneſs that governs them; makes it impoſſible they ſhould, in any caſe whatever, be ſubjects of divine grace. He has introduced this hell, making of it terminate in this world, to rid himſelf of the awful threatenings of an endleſs hell, in the world to come. In ſo doing, he has declared the grace of God to be totally uſeleſs. He cannot now plead, that it is an act of grace, for God to pour out his ſpirit on ſinners, and turn them from ſin to holineſs. On his plan, it would be no more an act of grace for God to create holy hearts in ſinful men, than it was to create Adam holy, in the beginning. It was an act of goodneſs for God to create Adam holy,

ly, at firſt; but not an act of grace. It was an act of goodneſs for him to uphold elect angels, while others fell; but not an act of grace. Grace implies favour or good beſtowed on ſuch as deſerve nothing but evil; and, unleſs the perſon receiving good ſtands condemned by the law, it cannot be an act of grace. Sinners, granting their ſufferings to be anſwerable to their ſins, are every moment placed on as good footing, in point of law, as if they every moment began their exiſtance anew. Yea, in Dr. H's ſcheme, the ſufferings of ſinners, in this world, evidently anſwer in lieu of perfect holineſs; placing them on the ſame foundation of works, or making them even with juſtice, as though they had hitherto lived in perfect holineſs. In this caſe, therefore, ſhould God create ſinners anew, after his own holy image, and by this deliver them from the great evil of ſin; although it might be eſteemed as an act of eminent goodneſs in him, yet it would not be reckoned an act of grace. It could no more be reckoned an act of grace, than for God to remove ſome natural evil, where there is no criminality, and where juſtice has no demand. *In the beginning*, there was an act of divine goodneſs, removing the great evil of natural darkneſs, or bringing natural light into exiſtence; which has ever ſince occaſioned happineſs to millions of holy beings. And God prevented everlaſting evil taking place on the elect angels, when he was under no more obligation to do it, than he was to uphold ſuch as fell. This eminent act of goodneſs was done without a mediator, and without the leaſt manifeſtation of grace. If God can prevent evil without the leaſt manifeſtation of grace, he can alſo recover from evil, without the leaſt manifeſtation of grace; provided neither law nor juſtice ſtand in the way. In Dr. H's ſenſe, the ſufferings of ſinners fulfil the whole law; and the perfect obedience of holy angels can do no more. Hence, ſinners merit a recovery from ſin, on his plan, and all the evils of it, as much as elect angels merited that act of divine goodneſs, by which they were upheld; and divine grace is diſplayed in one caſe no more than in the other.

Where then are the Doctor's high encomiums on the grace of God?—'All grace—infinite grace, as it reſpects ſinners: Sov-'reign grace in their regeneration, converſion, the gift of repent-'ance, faith, holineſs, conſolation, perſeverance, eternal glory: 'All grace, free grace, ſovereign grace, unſearchable riches of 'grace, from God to man.'*—Many other like expreſſions, the Doctor uſes; pretending, that, in his ſcheme, 'free grace and 'mere mercy abound to ſinners, more than could be poſſible in 'any other way.'† But when ſinners ſuffer *damnation* to the uttermoſt;

* P. 121. † P. 117.

uttermoſt; when they ſuffer *hell itſelf*, the ſame as devils do; and when every ſinner has ſuffered all the miſery he has hitherto deſerved, this grace, it ſeems, is only a ſound without ſubſtance.

The diſciples of Dr. H, and all that deny future puniſhment, are now welcome to come forward and make their choice: one or the other of the following things they muſt chooſe. Either firſt, that the curſe of the law is wholly done away; or ſecondly, that it is partly in force, or only in force as it relates to this life; or thirdly, that the ſufferings of men in this life have no reference to the divine law, but are the inſeparable connections and conſequences of ſin—ſin, in its own nature, or according to the nature of things, being neceſſarily connected with miſery. As to the

1. Suppoſe the curſe of the law be wholly done away, and of courſe no curſe threatened in the goſpel, we are then brought back again on the ſame ground: all the threatenings to men, in the bible, are but an empty ſound.—With equal propriety another famous divine may riſe up and aſſert, that all the *bleſſings* promiſed in the bible, to the righteous, are words without meaning. Beſide, if the curſe of the law be wholly done with, and no evil to ſinners threatened in the ſacred volume, then God puniſhes ſinners, in this world certainly, without law or goſpel, without rule. He may, therefore, do the ſame in the next world. Hence, we have no ſecurity on this ground.

2. Suppoſe the curſe of the law be in force, only as it relates to this life, then again the threatenings which look forward to eternity, are but an empty ſound. This renders uſeleſs a conſiderable part of the ſacred writings. And, as well may one riſe up and plead, that all the bleſſings that look forward to eternity are without meaning. But if the curſe of the law remains in force as to the preſent, and repealed as to the future life; then how do 'the law and the goſpel, being diametrically oppoſite to each 'other, run ſide by ſide in eternity, in the ſame manner as they do 'in time?' Then what becomes of that grand argument, on which the Doctor would build his whole ſcheme?

3. If the ſufferings of men in this life have no reference to the divine law, but are inſeperably connected with ſin—ſin, according to the nature of things, neceſſarily connected with miſery; then all threatenings, whether they relate to time or eternity, are at an end. Dr. H. directs civil rulers to 'enact good and whole-'ſome laws, in favour of all virtue, and good conduct; and in 'terrible oppoſition to all wickedneſs.'* The reaſon for this is, he ſays, 'hardened ſinners are not at all reſtrained by the threat-'enings of eternal damnation.—Preſent, viſible puniſhments ſtrike 'them

* P. 294.

'them with dread, and greatly reſtrain them. A fine, a priſon, 'a whip, and a gibbet have great influence to ſuppreſs their enormities.'* But how ſo, if ſin and miſery, in the nature of things, are inſeparable? And 'a man always miſerable according to 'his degree of wickedneſs?' On this plan, a man may as well change places with the culprit, at the ſtake, and take the thirty-nine laſhes on his own body, as to ſtand ſpectator at the ſcene. Every one's miſery is neceſſary, in the nature of things, to his ſin, and cannot be increaſed only as he increaſes in ſin: thus the Doctor's groſs impoſition upon common ſenſe.

Again, provided the ſufferings of men in this life have no reference to the divine law, then they do not ſuffer for their ſins. Neither is ſin, in this caſe ſinful; that which has no reference to the divine law, has no criminality in it. And Dr. H's book, throughout, gives a wrong colouring both to ſin and holineſs; tending to blend them together, ſo to diſguiſe the real nature and deſert of ſin. To pretend the miſery of men, in this life, is in proportion to their ſins, is at once to make ſin quite another thing from what it is, and reduce it almoſt to nothing. Allowing the wicked to have ſome degree of trouble, in this world, what is this compared to their full deſert?—'Until I went into 'the ſanctuary of God; then underſtood I their end. How are 'they brought into deſolation, as in a moment! They are ut-'terly conſumed with terrors.'†

As this pretended 'ſyſtem of real grace' ends in a ſyſtem of works, the moſt confuſed and contradictory, it would be needleſs to follow the Doctor any further, were it not to ſee how he abounds in contradictions. From this motive we may proceed, and obſerve again,

IV. To form an unanſwerable argument, and make us believe future puniſhment to be impoſſible, Dr. H. reaſons thus: 'God himſelf has fixed his own laws, in our ſouls, that abſo-'lutely forbid it. The law of nature is as really and truly the 'law of God, as the written word. Thoſe natural and inevita-'ble feelings, which are common to all rational creatures, whe-'ther holy or ſinful, whether angels or men, or of whatever rank 'or deſcription, are indeed the laws of God. The whole law of 'nature is the law of Jehovah, the Author of nature; and a pure 'law too. By this law of God, he has made it forever abſolute-'ly impoſſible that any creature ſhould cordially, without any 'averſion of ſoul, freely conſent to be forever and ever in the 'moſt inexpreſſible pain and torment. God's law of nature cries 'out againſt it, with all the authority of the divine Being him-'ſelf.

* P. 230. † Pſal. 73. 17, 19.

'self. Much less can any holy soul be willing to be an eternal 'sinner, an everlasting enemy to God, which is the grand, essen-'tial thing in that hell the *limitarians* plead for.'*

The Doctor here seeks to find a cover, by falsely asserting that his opponents hold hell to be nothing but perfection of sin, that they also hold that a man must be 'willing to be an everlasting 'enemy to God,' before he can be saved, which is contrary to the law of God. Yet his meaning is that the law of God cries out against the endless damnation of sinners; or it is plain he would here crowd this idea into the minds of his readers. He says, 'the law of nature is as really and truly the law of God, as 'his written word. These natural and inevitable feelings, which 'are common to all rational creatures, whether holy or sinful, 'whether angels or men, or of whatever rank or description, are 'indeed the law of God.' But who does not know that impenitent sinners, universally, wish they might not be eternally damned, whether they ever repent in this life or not? To make it certain this will not be their awful doom, it is natural for them to desire that all men might escape eternal damnation. But these inevitable feelings, the laws of nature, even the desires of sinners, Dr. H. calls the law of God, and a pure law too; and these inevitable feelings cry out against endless damnation. Therefore his argument is, the law of God cries out against the endless damnation of sinners, and whether they ever repent, or not. He often has recourse to this argument from his own experience, and on the principle that his 'own soul is formed on the general, the 'universal plan of human nature.'† Again, he says, 'You, my reader, know, in your own soul, that you sincerely and cordially love your neighbour, and daily give him every possible proof of it.'‡ He goes on here to extol the love we have towards our neighbours; then asks the question, What this love is when com-'pared to the wonderful love, mercy and pity the redeemer dai-'ly shows toward every child of Adam?'—He directly adds, 'After all this, for us to say, that it is his will and disposition to 'damn most of mankind in person, to all eternity, appears to me 'not honourable to the true character of Christ, or agreeable to 'his word.' This love, as the Doctor calls it, toward our own salvation, and the salvation of our neighbours, 'whether we are 'holy or sinful,' he had before asserted to be the principle implanted in us by the author of nature, it being the law of God itself. Therefore if we feel a desire to escape hell, that our neighbours also should escape, God feels a desire infinitely greater, and will certainly fulfil that desire. This is a capital argument among

* P. 278. † P. 312. ‡ P. 322.

univerſaliſts. But ſinners, the moſt abandoned eſpecially, with with their whole hearts, as the only chance they have while they perſevere in ſin, that all men might be ſaved. This Dr. H. calls the law of God, which cries for the ſalvation of all men, and cries againſt the eternal perdition of ſinners. Now view the Doctor in his own dreſs. These *inevitable feelings of nature*, or *the law* of God, he ſays, cries out againſt the endleſs miſery of man, *with all the authority of the divine Being himſelf.* Again, he ſays, 'The law every where denounces the infinite and 'everlaſting wrath of God, and endleſs miſery to man, in caſe of 'the leaſt failure.' The law knows nothing of mercy or of mitigation.'* 'The law demands perfection; curſes for want of it; 'and cries vengeance.'† Thus has Dr. H. ſet the divine law, or what he calls the divine law, at an eternal war with itſelf.

To ſet up our own feelings for the rule of judgment, is to ſubvert all rule and order, whether civil or ſacred. The murderer, for inſtance, has his inevitable feelings, at the bar of civil juſtice; crying out againſt the law that condemns him. To follow Dr. H's rule, this murderer muſt accordingly be acquitted. Dr. H. would have, as we have ſeen, 'civil rulers enact good laws, in terrible oppoſition to all wickedneſs.' But why ſo? This *pure law*, which is *indeed the law of God*, in every man's breaſt, muſt ſupercede all human laws. So when the prophets, or Chriſt and the apoſtles come with a *revealed law*, it muſt firſt be tried by this *ſtandard within*, or *pure law of nature.*

There is one thing every man carries in his own breaſt. Which muſt give him a ſore conflict, before he can be reconciled to Dr. H's ſcheme. Conſcience ſpeaks & will be heard. Conſcience witneſſes that God is *a jealous God, and will by no means clear the guilty*, or finally impenitent.

At length, my dear Friend, we have had a view of Dr. H's looſe and contradictory notions of law and goſpel: that is, as to his principal articles. For, to deſcend to particulars would lead to a train of endleſs contradictions. We ſhall therefore content ourſelves with the following *ſummary* of what we have ſeen in this, and the laſt preceding Letter.—The law and the goſpel not only ſtand in direct oppoſition to each other, as to their outward operation, but in their own natures are they in jarring oppoſition—The curſe of the law is fully ſatisfied in Chriſt; ſtill the law cries vengeance; and cries againſt the honour of God, and the happineſs of the univerſe—The goſpel, *the voice of fact*, ſpeaks nothing but good to men; ſtill it is *a fact*, Judas and all the wicked, while in this life, ſuffer hell itſelf—The voice of the whole

* P. 42. † P. 43.

whole law, and the voice of the gospel are exceedingly distinct, and diametrically opposite; but they perfectly agree in this, *the salvation of all men*—The gospel is all grace, unsearchable riches of grace, from God to man, and the only way of salvation for lost men; but all men are justified, and saved on the covenant of works—The curse of the law, and every evil threatened to men, and all that men deserve, is inflicted on Christ; men suffer, however, the full desert of their sin, as fast as they become guilty—The law cries out against eternal perdition, and pleads for the salvation of all; but this law every where denounces the infinite wrath of God, and endless misery to man.—These glaring contradictions lie at the bottom of the Doctor's scheme. 'If this 'distinction of law and gospel is without foundation,' he says, 'my whole argument falls to the ground. So does the whole of 'divine revelation.'* Two principles, directly opposite to each other, cannot both be true. And a scheme built entirely with contradictions must fall to the ground. But we see what value Dr. H. puts upon revelation, when he will as readily renounce it wholly, as he will give up those arguments which will forever be jarring and warring together.

I am, &c.

LETTER VIII.

Dr. H's sentiment that believers have only negative virtue, *compared to the character he takes to himself.*

MY DEAR FRIEND,

TO pave the way for all to go to heaven, universalists often reduce believers much upon a level with unbelieveres. But would assume to themselves an eminent share of christian virtue; professing to abound in love for the happiness of their fellow-men.

Accordingly, Dr. H. says, 'Whatever difference there may 'be between the grace given to one and another, in this life, the 'character, temper and ways of all the human race agree in ma-'ny things more than they differ. Bring all the human race to-'gether, and their dissimilitude will be very small, in comparison 'to their general agreement. A present believer hath, indeed, 'something, which a present unbeliever hath not; and God 'knows what a *little something* it is.'† By 'the grace given to 'one and another, in this life,' the Doctor means that some degree of grace is given to all men. 'All men,' he says, 'are much the 'better

* P. 191. † P. 237.

'better for Chriſt, and on account of the influence he has on 'their hearts.' This we have ſeen in Letter IV. The *little ſomething* of difference between believers aud infidels, he therefore gives off with an air of contempt. 'God knows what a '*little ſomething* it is!'

Dr. H. ſays again, 'When we ſpeak of the good heart of be-'lievers, and of their good and holy lives; and when we find 'theſe epithets in ſcripture, they are never to be underſtood in '*ſtrict propriety of ſpeech*, but only in a *comparative ſenſe* i. e. '*leſs wicked*, in the exerciſes of their hearts, as to the real mat-'ter of theſe exerciſes, than unbelievers are, or than they them-'ſelves were, in a ſtate of unregeneracy. It is the ſame with re-'gard to their good and holy lives: i. e. they are *much leſs wick-'ed*, as to the matter of their conduct, than once they were, or 'than unbelievers ordinarily are. But it is certain, that, in *pro-'priety* and *ſtrictneſs* of ſpeech, no poſitive goodneſs belongs to 'any human character on earth.'* Thus the Doctor blends both characters together, making no difference except in degrees of wickedneſs. The ſame may be ſaid when we compare ſinners together, one is *more wicked*, and another *leſs wicked*; but both having nothing but oppoſition of heart to holineſs. So that the difference lies wholly in the degrees of this oppoſition. Dr. H. ſometimes holds to total depravity, then again denies it, and pretends that all have ſome ſhare of grace or virtue, as we have juſt ſeen. But his object in the above paſſages is to make believers and unbelievers both one, excepting degrees of wickedneſs. The ſame as when we compare one unbeliever with another, neither of them having the leaſt 'poſitive goodneſs,' though one has not ſo great ſtrength of wickedneſs as the other. This Dr. H. further confirms, as in theſe words: 'All may be in heaven 'together in God's own time, with as great a diſtinction of reward 'there, as of character here.'† Allowing this of all mankind, as he here intends, and it is not poſſible there ſhould be a difference as to theſe two characters, only as one may be *leſs wicked* than the other. All the goodneſs therefore, that Dr. H. aſcribes to the believer, is only *comparative* or *negative*; the believer, in his ſenſe, is not quite ſo bad as the unbeliever. This *little ſomething* alſo that makes them differ, he conſiders as a *little* contemptible thing.

But the doctor will not allow ſuch believers as hold to endleſs puniſhment. to be *leſs wicked* than unbelievers. He labours to make his opponents *more wicked* than the whole race of heathen and infidels. He firſt claſſes them with the apoſtate Jews, then with

* P. 234. † Ibid.

with Judas, then with the proudeſt of phariſees. And their good diſtinctions of outward privileges, and means of grace, even of grace itſelf, only tend, he ſays, to ſtimulate them in pride, and to encloſe themſelves in 'palaces of diſtinction and honour;' and to look with ſovereign contempt upon all the world beſide. This the Doctor ſays of all his opponents, making no exception, as was ſhown in Letter V. and becauſe they ſo oppoſe univerſal ſalvation.

Now ſee the contraſt. Speaking of himſelf, in the introduction of his book, the Doctor ſays, 'Being much diſpoſed to a 'ſtudious life, and always delighting greatly in books, he ſpent 'much of his time in reading and enquiring, in the early periods 'of life. Amidſt all the vanities and follies of youth, yet ac-'quainting his heart with wiſdom, even while he too much laid 'hold on folly. Being alſo much favored, by a kind providence, 'with regard to the beſt means of inſtruction, and a pious exam-'ple from his parents in his early days, and afterwards with a 'more public education; the diſpoſition of his heart inclined him, 'in great preference to all other employments, to the ſtudy of di-'vinity, and to become a preacher of the goſpel.'* The Doctor has choſen ſome of the moſt decided words to denote true fear and love of God.—'Acquainting his heart with wiſdom.' Solomon uſes the words in the ſame manner, Eccl. ii. 3. and in another place ſays, 'The fear of the LORD is the beginning of 'wiſdom.'† Therefore, amidſt all the follies of youth, with which he was ſurrounded, Dr. H. ſays he gave himſelf up to fear and love God. And being much diſpoſed to a ſtudious life, and always *delighting greatly* in books; and being under the beſt means of inſtruction, and a pious example from his parents in his early days,—*he* '*applied his heart to know, and to* '*ſearch, and to ſeek out wiſdom.*'‡ In his early days, it would ſeem, he imitated if not exceeded, Solomon in his old age. This 'diſpoſition of his heart inclined him, in great preference to all 'other employments, to the ſtudy of divinity, and to become a 'preacher of the goſpel.' His mind was very ſtrongly inclined, *in great preference*, and from the pureſt motives, to the moſt important, as well as ſelf-denying work, in the redeemer's kingdom. Is not this ſomething more than being *leſs wicked?*

Though he ſays, while in early life, 'He too much laid hold on fol-'ly,' yet he impliedly profeſſes to have overcome, ſoon after, all the follies of youth, and all the vanities of human nature; and to have given himſelf up wholly to his God. Thus he ſolemnly declares: 'I am quite ſatisfied with what God has ſaid in its plaineſt mean-ing;

* P. 5. † Prov. 9. 10. ‡ Prov. 7. 25.

'ing; and as well satisfied with it, if it is above my reason, as if 'it is otherwise. Yea, if wholly opposite to my best reasonings, I 'I only thence infer my own ignorance and weakness, and fully be-'lieve and obey my God: even as I would have my little children 'believe what I tell them, and do what I bid them.'* 'I am edified, 'and comforted by every serious, honest man, that I hear talk upon 'his religion, whatever degrees of light God hath been pleased to 'give him, be they more or less. I am most edified where there is 'most light; but truly the light is sweet, even in the least degrees of 'it. I find something from God given to every sect, and party; and 'that gives me delight.'† 'I am quite willing God should make me 'holy and happy, for the glory of his own name, and all my fellow 'sinners without exception, if he please.'‡ 'When I have the 'deepest sense of these things, the world and creatures appear to me 'as nothing, yea, less than nothing and vanity, and God all in all.'§ 'The author,' meaning himself, 'is quite beyond a doubt, in his 'own mind, with regard to the solid truth of his leading princi-'ples and arguments. With respect to the *due time* of advanc-'ing this step forward, and so explicitly pouring in this addition-'al light, he is not so positive. There are, however, several con-'siderations that have weight in my mind, to make the publica-'tion without further delay; such as these. I have spent more 'than *twenty years* in the most careful reading and attention to 'every thing relating to this subject; and, I think, with a single 'eye, and ardent desire to know the truth, and to avoid all false-'reasoning, and every groundless conclusion. *I have no interest* '*but in the truth.*'‖

How could the Doctor have given himself a better character? What words could he have used, more strongly to express a deep sense of divine things, as well as unfeigned love to his neighbour, and supreme love to God? He 'is quite beyond a doubt' as to the truth of his own scheme, and so explicitly pouring into the world this additional light; provided the *due time* for it be already come. And the light of his own mind, with his singleness of heart, are the reasons why his book should be published without further delay. He is quite satisfied with all God has said in his word, whether it be wholly opposite to his own best reasonings, or not. He fully believes and obeys his God, just as he would have his little children believe and obey him: He is edified by the religious conversation of all parties, and most edified where there is most light. The world is to him less than nothing, and God all in all. To complete the whole, he professes to have, emphatically, *no interest but in the truth.* Thus when he comes

to

* P. 47. † P. 270. ‡ P. 291. § P. 312. ‖ P. 19.

to speak of himself, instead of saying he has no *positive goodness*, but is only *less wicked*; his words, to say the least, carry a strong aspect of sinless perfection. And after he has given the worst of characters to his opponents, and reduced all believers very much upon a level with unbelievers, this is the high character he takes to himself:

To announce to the world his own extensive knowledge and admirable talents he has made out the introduction to his essay, in such language as this: 'What now appears, is a small part of a SYSTEM of DIVINITY, which the author has been meditating more 'than *twenty years*. A critical view of the covenant people of 'God, in every age, and in every part of the world, where divine 'revelation has been embraced; and also of the mythology of all 'the nations of the earth that have not been favoured with the 'sacred oracles, fell naturally in the way of his contemplations, as 'he was proceeding on a very extensive scale.'* This *very extensive scale* he explains, in these words: 'It differs no 'more from the doctrine of *Calvin*, *Owen*, and *Edwards*, and 'the great body of protestants, than a circle as large as the periphery 'of the earth, differs from a circle of the diameter of one cubit.'† —The Doctor goes on to say, 'Innumerable criticisms on the 'original language in which the sacred oracles were first written, 'are left out in this publication. Because the author did, and 'does still suppose, that such a number of criticisms, as he found 'his own thoughts naturally led into, would, if inserted, much be-'wilder the minds of most of his readers. And lastly, this would 'much swell the volume, and embarrass any printer in this coun-'try, for want of proper types, and practice.'‡

The Doctor wrote the introduction to his *essay*, from which this last paragraph is taken, we may conclude, just before his death; and, directly after this, his book was printed. Several years before this date, Mr. Isaiah Thomas, a famous printer in Massachusetts, beside his periodical publications, a vast many pamphlets, several sets of history, &c. &c. printed the bible in two large folio volums, and in one large quarto volume; and executed the whole, it is said, with as much accuracy and neatness as if it had been done in Great Britain; and did it within about two or three years. The noted Voltaire is said to have employed eight or ten chosen writers, and seated them all at one table; while he, himself, dictated for each one what to write; which was chiefly in extracting and compiling from other authors. This wonderful genius published, and left behind him, as many as forty or fifty large volumes. Notwithstanding, let Mr. Thomas and Com-

pany,

* P. 17. † P. 170. ‡ P. 18.

pany, which was entered into, as appears, before Dr. H. wrote his *introduction;* let them lay aſide their periodical publications, and they could, free from the embarraſſment Dr. H. tells of, print for two, three, or more, ſuch geniuſes as Voltaire, with all their aſſiſtants. But, the Doctor comes forward, with great ſwelling words of vanity, and aſſerts that he could ſo "*ſwell the volume,*' 'as to embarraſs any printer in this country, for want of proper 'types, and practice.' Mr. Thomas, before the year 1780, had Hebrew and Greek types, for the original languages of the ſacred oracles. But the true meaning is, Dr. H. would have the world believe, that he was able to ſtudy and write, equal to two, three, or more of Voltaire, with their numerous attendants. It is granted, we have the ſame reaſon to credit this, as we have the reſt of his book.

The chief thing to be remarked, in this place, Dr. H. ſays he has done all this, 'he thinks, with a ſingle eye, and ardent deſire 'to know the truth, and to avoid all falſe reaſoning, and every 'groundleſs concluſion.' He unreſervedly declares, '*I have no 'intereſt but in the truth,*' He has uſed the pronoun *I*, or ſpoken in the firſt perſon, nearly 400 times in 331 pages; and generally with an air of great authority, as appears from the quotations already made. And his own aſſertions are more frequent than texts of ſcripture, or arguments drawn from the ſcriptures. For the truth of theſe things, there need only be an appeal made to his book. Therefore, to ſay nothing of that almoſt unbounded knowledge he would aſſume to himſelf; when we compare that goodneſs of heart he profeſſes to have, in ſuch an eminent degree as to give weight and authority throughout his writings; to that vileneſs of heart he has aſcribed to his opponents, and that diminutive or only negative goodneſs he has aſcribed to all believers; when we compare theſe things together, we have the true ſpirit and genius of the *author*. He has charged his opponents with *monopolizing*, with *limiting*, and 'their partial and much lim-'ited covenant of redemption,' as he is pleaſed to call it. How much the Doctor has *monopolized* and *limited* to his own *dear ſelf*, the public will judge.

It is granted, when a man writes his own diary, or memoirs for himſelf; ſo in many other caſes, it is convenient and neceſſary to ſpeak in the firſt perſon. But when a point of doctrine is to be ſettled, where ſcripture evidence alone can decide, for a man to ſpeak in the firſt perſon, evidently wiſhing to recommend his ſcheme by his own authority, this betrays either the weakneſs of his ſcheme, or his ignorance of the holy Scriptures. But the latter

latter cannot be charged on the Doctor. Therefore, his frequent uſe of *egotiſms*, or of the pronoun *I* in the room of ſcripture evidence, only expoſes the weakneſs and fallacy of his own ſcheme.

Thinking to prove that believers have only *negative* virtue, or that they are only *leſs wicked*, Dr. H. has recourſe to what Job, David, and Paul ſay concerning their remaining ſin. But what they ſay on this article proves againſt him. Job ſays, 'I 'abhor myſelf, and repent in duſt and aſhes.'* This was to hate ſin in himſelf: turn from it, reject it, or put it away. Every believer has this principle of hatred to ſin, though not to ſo great a degree as Job had at this time. But the loweſt degree of this hatred to ſin is right oppoſite to every moral exerciſe of the unbeliever's heart. There cannot be a greater difference and oppoſition, in the nature of things, than there is between hating ſin and ſtriving to be free from it, and, on the contrary, loving of it, and holding of it faſt, with one's whole ſtrength. There cannot be a greater difference, as to the nature of the caſe, than there is between *dying* daily unto ſin and living unto righteouſneſs, and on the other hand, *living* in ſin, making ſin one's element and *life*, and increaſing in it. What greater odds in the nature of things, than between *dying* and *living?* Therefore, David and Paul ſay, and right againſt the Doctor,—'My wounds ſtink, and are cor-'rupt: becauſe of my fooliſhneſs.'† 'O wretched man that I 'am! Who ſhall deliver me from the body of this death?'‡ Inſtead of ſin being loathſome and deadly to the impenitent ſinner, it is the very thing his ſoul luſteth after. He never had the leaſt poſſible perception that ſin, in its own nature, was loathſome; but in every appearance of it, it is to him an amiable object; and more ſo the longer he lives in it.

We have alſo the words of Chriſt, directly to this point. 'No 'man can ſerve two maſters: for either he will hate the one, and 'love the other; or elſe he will hold to the one, and deſpiſe the other. 'Ye cannot ſerve God and mammon.'§ The difference, therefore, between the ſervants of God and the ſervants of mammon, is, the former love God and the latter love mammon. The love alſo in both theſe caſes ſtands oppoſed, one to the other; and Chriſt here ſhows that it cannot be otherwiſe. Not as Dr. H. ſays, that one has a *leſs degree* of love to mammon, ſo a *leſs degree* of hatred to God, than the other. But one has love to God and hatred to mammon, while the other has love to mammon and hatred to God. And Chriſt plainly teaches that no man can be his diſciple, unleſs he can freely give up all out of love to him; and even lay down his own life for Chriſt's ſake. But, of un-

 believers

* Job 42. 6. † Pſal. 38. 5. ‡ Rom. 7. 24. § Matt. 6. 24.

believers Chriſt ſays, 'They have both ſeen and hated both me 'and my Father.'* So the apoſtle decides this difference, by ſhowing *charity* to be the only thing which is morally excellent. Without charity there is *nothing*, nothing morally good. Here we again find a *poſitive* difference. To ſay no more, the unbeliever, and every unbeliever is totally deſtituté of moral goodneſs. So his moral ſtate materially differs from the believer's. Baſe metal or droſs that has not one particle of gold in it, materially differs from gold, though this gold be mixed with droſs. So the believer, though ſome ſin remains in him, has ſomething the unbeliever has not; he has *charity*, the only moral excellency in the univerſe. Hence, theſe two characters differ, as light differs from darkneſs. This is not all. The apoſtle ſhows the unbeliever to be wholly *ſelfiſh*, or to have *a carnal mind* which is *enmity againſt God*. This *enmity*, or this *ſelfiſhneſs* is directly oppoſed to that *charity* which *ſeeketh not her own*, but ſeeketh the glory of God and the beſt good of his kingdom. As every unbeliever is governed by this ſelfiſhneſs, and every believer by this charity, we of courſe have the difference between them; as great, in the nature of things, as can be imagined.

There is no need of dwelling on this point. The difference between ſaints and ſinners, is one of the moſt plain and important doctrines, throughout the ſacred pages. It is one of the firſt duties enjoined on God's miniſters, under the ancient as well as the new covenant, to 'teach his people, the difference be-'tween the holy and profane, and cauſe them to diſcern between 'the unclean and the clean:'† that is, between the righteous and the wicked. In many places in his book, the Doctor allows this difference, juſt as it is taught in the bible. He ſays, 'Where 'this faith is, there certainly will be a bitter hatred and averſion 'to all ungodlineſs. The very diſcovery of God which I am 'ſpeaking of, neceſſarily involves in it a perception and ſenſe of 'infinite amiableneſs, beauty and glory. The infinite lovelineſs 'of God, and ſalvation by grace through Jeſus Chriſt, are the 'eſſential objects of the faith I maintain. This wholly agrees 'with the old calviniſtic doctrine of ſaving faith. No acquaint-'ance with God or divine truth, without a feeling impreſſion of 'the divine lovelineſs on our ſouls, was ever thought to be ſav-'ing faith by *Calvin*, *Owen*, or any eminent promoters of the 'proteſtant cauſe. Their object of faith is exactly the ſame which 'I contend for; and the manner of communication and opera-'tion is the ſame, as wrought by the power of God, working by 'love, and purifying the heart, even as God is pure.'‡ 'We do 'not

* John 15. 24. † Ezek. 44. 23. ‡ P. 134, 135.

'not conſider aſſurance of our ſalvation to be of the eſſence of 'ſaving faith; but merely conſequential, even as hath been uſual 'with proteſtants. The faith we contend for has nothing imme-'diately and directly to do with ourſelves, but with the object of 'our faith. When this faith is wrought in us, by the power 'and grace of God, and proper fruits enſue; thence we argue 'our ſafe eſtate by way of conſequence, and ſo make our calling 'and election ſure. We unite with the orthodox in all ages, in 'ſaying, that hatred to all ſin is the fruit of faith; or that ſaving 'knowledge and ſupreme love of God are through faith.'*

It ſeems impoſſible but what Dr. H. ſhould know how he contradicts himſelf. The faith of ſuch as hold to endleſs puniſhment, he has ſaid again and again, is wholly oppoſed to free grace, and all the offers of grace; and that no man can be juſtified by grace, on their plan. So to make out his own ſcheme of faith, he has made our own certain knowledge, that we ſhall be ſaved, neceſſary, in order to have a proper warrant to believe in Chriſt for ſalvation. This we have ſeen in Letters I. II. V. But here he ſays, 'We do not conſider aſſurance of our ſalvation to be of the eſſence 'of ſaving faith; but merely conſequential, even as hath been 'uſual with proteſtants. The faith we contend for has nothing 'immediately and directly to do with ourſelves, but with the object 'of our faith. We unite with the orthodox in all ages,' &c. &c.

But his uniting with the *orthodox*, in making true faith conſiſt in 'a bitter hatred and averſion to all ungodlineſs,' and 'ſupreme 'love of God;' ſo making the wideſt difference between believers and unbelievers, then again denying this difference by reducing of it to nothing, is the ſame as denying of it throughout. He therefore falls into this aggravated crime of putting *no difference between the holy and profane*. And this argues the weakneſs as well as baſeneſs of his cauſe.

I am, &c.

LETTER IX.

Mr. Relly's Scheme of Union, examined.

My dear Friend,

DR. Huntington's idea on this ſubject will ſhow us Mr. Relly's. The Doctor has taken his from Mr. Relly's. It will of courſe facilitate matters to ſee the Doctor's firſt, as things are in readineſs to bring his into view at once. Speaking

* Ibid.

Speaking of *election* Dr. H. ſays, 'As it reſpects mankind, 'after death, it centers in one head, Chriſt the Son of God, the 'Son of man, the only mediator between God and man; and all 'human kind, as his kindred body. This head is in a like na- 'tural and *fœderal* connection with the whole body of human 'nature.'* 'God has one *elect head* and no more; and one '*elect body* and no more. The *elect head* is the Son of man, in 'equal connection with all human nature. The *elect body* is all 'human nature.'† He ſays many other things to ſhow how Chriſt is in one and the ſame union with all men: whether believers or unbelievers, he makes no difference. Believers come into the enjoyment of the bleſſing, he ſuppoſes, by their believing. But their relation to Chriſt was the ſame before their believing as afterwards. All mankind being one with Chriſt as the *body* is one with the *head*, from which the Doctor concludes the ſalvation of all men. The thing is for him to eſtabliſh his premiſes, before he makes his favorite concluſion.

But we have only to compare his ſcheme of *union* with itſelf, or with his leading ſentiments and arguments. And, as we have ſeen, his ſcheme ſhuts up the kingdom of heaven againſt men ſo long as they remain in this world. He can exhort no one ſinner to repent and believe in Chriſt, until ſuch ſinner is indeed dead; unleſs he exhorts him to make God a liar in believing: He makes the outward privileges of the goſpel to be of no benefit to men, while in this life: He makes the light of the goſpel to be of no benefit in preparing men for happineſs, in the life to come: His ſcheme conſiders all the judgments ſent on men, in this world, to be of no ſervice whatever, whether here or hereafter: His ſcheme ſaves not one of the human race from the *curſe* of the law, or from *the pains of hell*; but every one ſuffers the full deſert of his ſins, as faſt as his deſert ariſes. What then is the amount of the Doctor's *union*?—On his plan, not one of our race can be ſaved by grace; if any are ſaved it is by their own works, or by their own merit: His ſcheme conſiders the ſtate of the redeemed, after death, to be nothing more than a myſtical heaven; and may as well be called a place of miſery as a place of happineſs: He makes no eſſential difference, neither in this nor the next ſtate, between the righteous and the wicked: His way of arguing proves Chriſt to be the *Deſtroyer* of all men, as fully as it proves him to be the *Saviour* of all men. His boaſted ſcheme of *union* is of courſe a ſcheme of confuſion and deſtruction; it completely deſtroys itſelf.

This ſhows the iſſue of Mr. Relly's. His has all the leading things as the Doctor's has; the latter being taken from the former, as

* P. 82. † P. 81.

as we ſhall now ſee.—Mr. Relly ſays, 'The union between 'Chriſt and the *people* (meaning *all men*) is ſuch, that they *as* '*members* of his body, of his fleſh and of his bones, were in him in 'his birth, that they might inherit the bleſſings of his holy nativ-'ity.'* 'He (Chriſt), as having the people in himſelf, had the 'right of redemption, and *as* them, ſtood engaged to fulfil every 'requiſite to the glory of God, and their eternal ſalvation: which 'requiſites were *firſt* a holy principle, a privation of original 'guilt, fulfilled in his birth; a juſt obſervance of the law, and 'conformity to the divine nature, fulfilled in his life; and a 'full propitiation for the ſin that was paſt, accompliſhed in his 'ſufferings and death. The whole of which, he did; as con-'taining the people (all men) in himſelf, who are upon that account, 'not only repreſented as being in him, in his birth, as above; 'but alſo in the whole of his life, death and reſurrection. In 'him were they circumciſed, and the body of the ſins of their 'fleſh, put off by the circumciſion of Chriſt. In him fulfilling 'the law, and walking in all the ordinances of God blameleſs.'† Mr. Relly here makes all men perfect, 'walking in all the ordin-'ances of God blameleſs,' becauſe they are all in Chriſt, and Chriſt does theſe duties for them. Dr. Huntington conſiders all men perfect in the ſame ſenſe: 'Their garments,' he ſays, 'are all alike 'waſhed, and made white in the blood of the Lamb.' So there are ſeveral other leading ſentimets, in the above quotations, which exactly agree with the Doctor's.

Mr. Relly continues: 'Crucified with him (Chriſt,) and that 'the reſurrection of Chriſt, was the reſurrection of the people 'from death,' (the reſurrection of all men from death.) He then applies theſe words of the apoſtle to all men; 'Even when we 'were dead in ſins, hath quickened us together with Chriſt: And 'hath raiſed us up together, and made us ſit together in heavenly 'places in Chriſt Jeſus.' 'From which it is evident,' ſays Mr. Relly, 'that the *union* between Chriſt and the *people* (all men,) 'was ſuch, as head and members in one body, that they were '*with him* and *in him*, in his birth, his life, his death, reſur-'rection and glory. Therefore his ſufferings, wars, and tri-'umphs, all are theirs.'‡ So Dr. Huntington ſays that the whole race of Adam, 'Go away into everlaſting puniſhment,' or rather into everlaſting happineſs; becauſe Chriſt ſuffers for them, *in their room and ſtead:* making all the threatenings to ſinners come on Chriſt, and every bleſſing, by Chriſt, to believers, come on the whole of mankind.

Speaking of the day of judgment, Mr. Relly ſays that we, or all men,

*† P. 52, 53. Boſton Edition; printed by Eras and Son, and having no date.

‡ P. 53, 54.

men, ſhall be 'judged according to the deeds done in the body, 'and giving an account at that day for every idle word, &c. all 'this, I ſay, hath its harmony and perfection in Jeſus.—In him 'ſanctified, in him accepted, and therefore appeal from the firſt 'Adam unto the ſecond. In like manner we account for the 'deeds done in the body, Jeſus having atoned for the evil, and 'done the good.'* In this way Mr. Relly ſuppoſes every one, at the laſt day, will give an account for himſelf, for every *idle word*, and for every deed done in the body: Chriſt having atoned for all their evil deeds, and done all the good deeds required of them. So Dr. Huntington holds, as we have ſeen, that all the threatenings to guilty men, are ſilenced and ſatisfied in Chriſt.

To the ſame import Mr. Relly ſays again: 'Standing in the 'grace of *union* with *Chriſt*, we are at peace with all the ſcrip-'tures. *He* in us and *we* in him, have fulfilled all righteouſneſs, 'fully kept the commandments of God, and ſuffered the puniſh-'ment due unto our ſins, and now inherit the promiſe, whilſt the 'voice of words, yea every terrifying ſound is ſilenced; and noth-'ing now heard but the ſound of grace, love, and good will.'† Mr. R. here, as he generally does, addreſſes himſelf to all mankind; making 'every terrifying ſound to be *ſilenced*,' both as to ſaints and ſinners. Which exactly agrees with Dr. H. in one main article.

And whoever will examine Mr. Relly's book, he may find (in pages 65 to 71, 84 to 86, 125 to 128, and 159,) that, with Dr. Huntington, he has made out his ſcheme with ſuch arguments and ſentiments as theſe: That the goſpel ſpeaks nothing but good both to ſaints and ſinners: That the law and goſpel are in direct oppoſition: That the law ſpeaks to all men alike: That there is no proper foundation laid for men to believe in Chriſt, unleſs they firſt know they are *elected* to eternal life: That men would make God a liar, in believing in Chriſt for eternal life, unleſs it is firſt made certain they are elected to eternal life: That all men have two characters, one good and the other bad: That all the threatenings in the bible reſpect none other but Chriſt: That all the awful woes and curſes in the bible, to God's enemies, are only an empty ſound: That we can have no truſt or confidence in God, unleſs we firſt know his providence and attributes are operating particularly in our favour: That believers have no poſitive, but only negative goodneſs: That there is no real difference between ſaints and ſinners, or between *the holy and profane!* As theſe ſentiments are clearly expreſſed by Mr. Relly, at the ſame time being the outlines and eſſential parts in Dr. Huntington's book; it proves both their ſchemes to be made up of the ſame jarring contrarieties.

* P. 110, 111. † P. 107.

contrarieties. Certainly Mr. Relly's must be the same contradictions as the Doctor's, for it is composed of the same principal arguments and sentiments. There is no need, therefore of following Mr. Relly any farther, except to see a few of his contradictions laid together.

Accordingly, to name one contradiction which runs through his book. He describes his antagonists as being some of the most stupid and vile set of creatures that ever lived He calls them 'barking curs;' governed by 'personal pique, personal enmity, self-interest, &c.' full of egregious vanity, and insolence; 'dextrous at making faults, where there is none;' and like 'some 'busy critic, whose genius leads him ever in search of offal, and 'garbage.'* Mr. Relly also very often calls his antagonists 'Antichrist.'† And a viler character cannot be found in scripture, than what he gives them. There is no need of inquiring whether all this be true, or whether his opponents deserve this character. The contradiction lies here: After all he has said about them, after he has dressed them up as odiously as possible; he then asserts them to stand as fair for, and to be as great favorites of heaven, as any men in the world; and, with all other men, to be going directly to heaven.

Again, Mr. Relly not only includes a part, but almost the whole of the christian world, under the name *Antichrist*. Thus he asserts, 'But Antichrist says, You cannot be saved, except you are holy and good in yourself.'—'But Antichrist says, 'there are *terms* and *conditions* to be complied with and fulfilled, before you can be saved.'‡ Mr. Relly is here trying to make us believe that repentance, faith, or holiness is not necessary to salvation, or to fit men for heaven. But almost all christendom, from the beginning, have professedly held this as being essential to salvation; and this gives us his meaning of Antichrist. After enumerating, and with an air of contempt, the gifts and graces of the holy Spirit; as righteousness, meekness, faith, humility, &c. he says, 'This is that Antichrist of whom 'we were told that He should come, yea, was so early in the 'world as the days of the apostles; and prevails so mightily 'in the christian world at present that the generality of christians under his influence, are upon a level in faith and doctrine 'with the Jews: or but very faintly distinguished from them.'§ Nearly the whole of the christian world, and in every past age, have professedly held these gifts and graces of the holy Spirit, as being necessary to salvation; for which Mr. Relly here calls them 'Antichrist.' He therefore includes almost all christendom, under

* P. 6, 7, 8. in his Introduction. † P. 129, 133, 134, 157, 158. ‡ P. 157, 159. § 129.

under the name, *Antichriſt*. Thus far Mr. Relly's *union*. Chriſt united to all men, and Chriſt united to 'Antichriſt!'

In another place he calls Antichriſt the *falſe Chriſt*. '*The falſe Chriſt*,' he ſays, 'is a compound of pride, darkneſs, deceit, ſelf-love, enmity to the true Chriſt, &c.'* He labours much to fix this character on all ſuch as diſagree with him in ſentiment. In ſo doing he has made out his monſtrous *union*. For if Chriſt is equally united with all men, he is then united with Mr. Relly's opponents, theſe moſt hateful characters, and therefore united to the *falſe Chriſt*, who is 'at enmity to the 'true Chriſt.' Chriſt in 'conſanguinity and affinity,' he ſays, with all men; and theſe members, of the ſame body, at enmity to Chriſt their Head! Theſe members alſo, at enmity to Chriſt their Head, he ſays, are in a ſtate of 'paſſivity, and Chriſt the 'active conſciouſneſs and quickening ſpirit of the whole.'† In a ſtate of *paſſivity*, and, his opponents eſpecially, at the ſame time *at enmity* to Chriſt; and in a ſtate of *paſſivity*, while Chriſt is the *quickening ſpirit* of the whole! Mr. Relly's words, however, if they have any meaning, make Chriſt to be at enmity with himſelf; or the body at enmity to the Head!

Mr. Relly, like Dr. Huntington after him, makes little or no difference between the regenerate and unregenerate. He applies to all men alike, the words of the prophet Micah; concerning the corrupt rulers of Iſrael and Judah, in that day of noted apoſtacy. He ſays, 'When I except this Man [the Man Chriſt Jeſus], 'I believe that word of the Lord applicable unto all the *others*, 'where he ſays, *the beſt of them is as a brier, the moſt upright is ſharper than a thorn hedge*.'‡ But, what violence is Mr. Relly guilty of, in applying, without exception, this paſſage to all men? The prophet was diſtinguiſhing thoſe corrupt rulers and judges from ſuch as were faithful to their truſt; elſe there would be no meaning to his words. Beſides, juſt before the above cited words, the prophet ſays, 'The good man is 'periſhed out of the earth, and there is none upright among men.' Implying, by theſe general terms, there had been good and righteous men; and that there were ſtill ſome few remaining, howſoever corrupt the generality of their rulers might be.—Mr. Relly ſays again, 'Nor is it poſſible I ſhould ever deſpiſe *good* 'works, on this account. But, wherever I have ſpoken ſlightly of human goodneſs, it is becauſe I am convinced it is not 'good; but a falſe ſhow, and lying vanity; and therefore a '*falſehood*, always to be oppoſed.'§ He ſays this of believers as well as unbelievers. It is allowed, as men are born into the world,

* P. 133. † P. 43. ‡ P. 26. Introduction. § P. 27. Ibid.

world, and as we all are *according to the fleſh*, there is no human goodneſs. 'There is none that doeth good, no, not one,'* is the *carnal* or natural ſtate of mankind. Where grace is implanted, however, it renews the heart, and reforms the practice.

After Mr. Relly has collected the moſt pertinent words of ſcripture, uſed to ſhow the entire depravity of the carnal heart, and of all impenitent men; after he has thus gone on to blacken every child of Adam, believers and unbelievers together, and made them as vile as poſſible; he then, in the ſame page, even calls God to witneſs his own gracious ſincerity and purity of motives. 'The God, and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, before whom I ſtand,' ſays he, knoweth that I lie not, when I 'declare, That there is but *one* Man, the Man Chriſt Jeſus, amongſt all the individuals of *Adam's race*, whoſe example I 'admire and can perfectly approve of: by his example, I confeſs I am deeply convinced, not to *envy*, but to the moſt profound admiration!—I cannot deſpiſe, but muſt forever reverence, admire, and wonder before Him.—O! Thou great Archetype of true holineſs, *Jeſus Chriſt*: thou only art holy, thou only art the Lord: and thou knoweſt wherefore I thus ſpeak. —I have thus ſpoken, thou knoweſt; becauſe I apprehend what I have ſpoken againſt, to be utterly falſe; a grand deception, and yet the Idol of mankind. Thou art my ſtandard, and everlaſting pattern of true goodneſs.—Unto thy grace and keeping I commit my all; and that thou ſhouldeſt bleſs what I have written, unto the glory and praiſe of thy venerable name: and reſpecting my readers, unto their conviction, even to that Eternal Life, which is in thee; I pray.—It may eaſily be ſeen, that I aim only at illuſtrating that grand capital propoſition of the Saviour's: *I am the truth*.—Reſpecting the *matter* and *ſcope* of the following treatiſe, I am above uncertainty therein.'†—After reading what Mr. Relly here ſays of himſelf, and what he ſays, in direct oppoſition, of every ſon of Adam, he might ſeem to be of a different order of rational beings, or one who never had apoſtatized.

Self-commendation carried to ſuch an height, thus ſeen in open day, and in its native colours, may, however, anſwer this good end: It may ſerve to open their eyes, and effectually cure thoſe writers, on the ſide of truth, who have in ſome degree fallen into the ſame diſgraceful practice. But thoſe writers who have maintained the doctrine of endleſs puniſhment, in oppoſition to *univerſaliſm*; and who have been generally eſteemed in the church of God, for one or two centuries paſt; have not

 been

* Rom. 3. 12. † P. 26, 31, 32, 33. Ibid.

been ſo fond of ſpeaking in the firſt perſon, or ſo liberal in beſtowing encomiums on their own works and characters. Neither have they exhibited their own experiences, or their own good feelings, with a view to render their doctrines popular, or to give ſupport to their ſentiments. For the truth of this, an appeal is made to their writings. And truly the great and moſt important doctrines, that look forward to eternity, ought firſt to be clearly ſupported by divine revelation. As to ſelf-commendation, ſeveral thouſand years ago, Solomon has told us, 'Let another man 'praiſe thee, and not thine own mouth; a ſtranger, and not 'thine own lips.'*

I am, &c.

* Prov. 27. 2.

END OF PART I.

Univerſaliſm confounds and deſtroys itſelf, &c.

PART II.

Dr. Chauncy's, Mr. Wincheſter's, Mr. Petitpierre's, and Med. Dr. Young's Scheme, which ſuppoſes a limited puniſhment hereafter, ſhown to be made up of contradictions.

LETTER I.

Mr. Wincheſter, following Dr. Chauncy, holds that all men are ſaved by Grace, and, in contradiction to this, that the damned ſuffer all they deſerve.

My dear Friend,

HAD you read *Dr. Edwards againſt Dr. Chauncy*, you would have found an anſwer to Mr. Wincheſter's *dialogues*. So, have ſaved yourſelf the trouble of your laſt requeſt to me. There appears nothing material in thoſe dialogues, on *univerſal reſtoration*, but what we find in Dr. Chauncy's *ſalvation of all men*. An anſwer to the latter is of courſe an anſwer to the former. And Dr. Edwards has given a complete anſwer, it is thought, to Dr. Chauncy. This makes it needleſs to attend minutely to things in Mr. Wincheſter's book; but only to ſtate ſome of his leading ideas, compare them together, and ſee their conſequences. In this caſe it will be moſt expedient, ſomewhat to pattern after Dr. Edwards in his reply to Dr. Chauncy.

Mr. Wincheſter holds that all men are ſaved by grace, and ſaved wholly by the grace of God. 'The Goſpel of the Grace 'of God,' he ſays, 'is in itſelf ſo amiable, and has ſomething in 'it ſo attracting and engaging, that wherever it has come, it has 'gained proſelites.—It bringeth ſalvation to all men. By *all* men, 'is to be underſtood every individual of the human race. It has 'been too good news for ſome, and too bad for others. And 'the objections they have raiſed againſt the *univerſality of its* '*grace, and fulleſt extent of its efficacy and mercy*, have been 'many and great.'* Thus he prefaces his book. He

* P. 1. *Hudſon Edition*: Printed 1793. From which all the following quotations are taken.

He ſays again, 'It is not ſo much the intention of God, merely to reſtrain ſin, as to ſhow it in all its dreadful deformity, puniſh it according to its deſert, and finally to ſhew the ſuper-abounding of his grace in overcoming and totally deſtroying it out of his creation; which ſhall be accompliſhed, when he that ſitteth upon his throne ſhall make all things new.'* By theſe words, 'to reſtrain ſin,—puniſh it according to its deſert,' &c. Mr. W. means, *to reſtrain ſinners*, and *puniſh them according to their deſert*. He has ſuggeſted no ſuch idea in his book, that ſin ſeparate from ſinners, is puniſhed. Beſide, by the words, 'to ſhew the ſuper-abounding of his grace in overcoming and totally deſtroying *it*,' that is *ſin*; he evidently means the ſuper-abounding of divine grace toward ſinners, in their complete *reſtoration* or ſalvation. The ſame which he often advances. Hence, he aſcribes the ſalvation of men to grace, and the 'ſuper-abounding' grace of God.

In another place, he ſays, 'Heaven forbid, that ever I ſhould, in the leaſt, ſet aſide the merits of Chriſt, the efficacy of his blood, or the ſaving operation of his ſpirit and grace!—Salvation from the guilt and pollution of ſin, is always aſcribed, and always will be to the blood of the Lamb; and the renovation of the ſoul to the operation of the Spirit of God,—the operation of the grace of God.'†

Speaking of the ſufferings of the wicked in a purifying fire, or ſtate of purgatory, as he pretends; he ſays, 'Thoſe who ſhall be caſt into the lake of fire, their torments and ſorrows ſhall bring them down, and, in the ſenſe of ſcripture, deſtroy them; and thus prepare them for the renewing power of Chriſt: but it cannot be ſaid, with any propriety, that their deſtruction ſhall reſtore them:—No; this is an honour which is reſerved for the Son of God alone, who came to ſeek and ſave the loſt.'‡ Hence, it is plain Mr. W. holds, that all men are ſaved by grace alone; and ſaved by the merits of Chriſt, by the merits of the Son of God alone. Other places in his book, to the ſame import, might be cited, were it neceſſary.

Should it be denied, however, that men are ſaved wholly by grace; that is, all who are ſaved; by the ſame rule Mr. Winchester's ſcheme muſt be denied and given up. So, by the ſame rule the holy ſcriptures muſt be denied. Furthermore, Mr. Winchester has written his book, profeſſedly to extol the grace of God, and our need of a Saviour; and to ſhow us that there is none other name given, whereby we muſt be ſaved. He pretends above all others, or certainly above his opponents, to teach

ſalvation

* P. 148. † P. 163. ‡ P. 165.

ſalvation by grace only, and ſpeaks of the 'ſuper-abounding 'grace' of God, as well as the infinite merits of Chriſt, being neceſſary to our juſtification. Theſe things are obvious to every one that reads his book.

In direct contradiction to this, Mr. Wincheſter holds that part of mankind ſuffer their full deſert. He holds that part of mankind die, and appear before God their Judge, in a ſtate of impenitency; and that all ſuch are damned. In this ſtate of damnation, which is for a limited ſeaſon or for ages of ages, they ſuffer, as he ſuppoſes, to the full amount of their evil deeds done in the body. The abſurdity and impoſſibility of grace to ſuch as ſuffer all they deſerve, we have already ſeen, and may ſee more of it hereafter. We ſhall firſt ſee what Mr. W. has ſaid as to the ſufferings of the damned. The following particulars, it is thought, will make it clear that he holds, that the damned, or ſuch as are ſentenced to a *purgatory*, ſuffer all they deſerve; and that ſome again, in this world, ſuffer all they deſerve. As,

1. To anſwer a charge brought againſt him, he ſays, 'Did I, 'like ſome, maintain, that there was no future puniſhment at all; 'it might, indeed, create an alarm.'—'*Future* and *proportionate* puniſhments there will be; every tranſgreſſion and diſobedience (unleſs men now repent and believe) ſhall hereafter receive a juſt recompenſe of reward.'*—Such as will not deny themſelves, in this world, in like manner as to cut off a right hand, or pluck out a right eye, he ſays, 'Should hereafter ſuffer 'infinitely greater inconveniences, by being caſt into hell fire. 'And, Oh! who can conceive how dreadful a portion is threatened to ſome tranſgreſſors! that they 'ſhall drink of the wine "of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture, "into the cup of his indignation; and ſhall be tormented with "fire and brimſtone. And the ſmoke of their torment aſcendeth up for the ages of ages; and they have no reſt day nor "night."†—The rich man mentioned in Luke xvi. 19. was actually caſt into hell, he ſays, 'And had *judgment without mercy*,' becauſe he had *ſhowed no mercy*.'‡—Speaking of the wicked in general that die in their ſins, he ſays, 'As they have 'lived and died in ſin, their deſtruction, or miſery is certain; 'and there is no remedy, that can prevent their experiencing 'the conſequences of crimes, and ſuffering the juſt puniſhment 'which ſhall be inflicted on them, according to their different 'deſerts.'§

Thus Mr. W. has aſſerted, that ſuch as die without repentance, ſhall ſuffer, in hell, 'puniſhments proportionate to their 'crimes—

* P. 5. † P. 51. ‡ P. 77 § P. 114.

'crimes—ſhall receive a juſt recompenſe of reward—ſhall drink 'of the wine of the wrath of God, which ſhall be poured out 'without mixture—ſhall receive judgment without mercy.' None ever pretended that the damned ſuffer more than their deſerts. No words can carry it further, than that they receive *judgment without mercy.* Mr. W. could hardly have uſed ſtronger terms than theſe: 'As they have lived and died in ſin, 'their deſtruction, or miſery is certain; and there is no remedy 'that can prevent their experiencing the conſequences of crimes, 'and ſuffering the juſt puniſhment which ſhall be inflicted on 'them, according to their different deſerts.'

2. All the threatenings in ſcripture to the impenitent and diſobedient, Mr. Wincheſter profeſſes to take in their moſt ſtrict and literal ſenſe. When he comes to explain Rev. xxii. 18, 19. he ſays, 'This ſcripture contains ſuch threatenings as are 'very terrible indeed; and ſhould make us exceeding careful 'not to contradict what God hath here revealed;—nor in any wiſe 'to explain away, or to weaken, the force of either the threat-'enings or promiſes.'* And thoſe who are found guilty of adding or taking 'away from the words of the book of this proph-'ecy,' as mentioned in the above paſſage, Mr. W. ſays concerning them, 'The amazing torments which they ſhall feel that 'have thoſe plagues added to them, and the dreadful loſs which 'they ſhall ſuſtain that have their part taken out of the book of 'life, and out of the holy city, cannot be even conceived.'† He allows that *all the plagues written in the book* are literally added, to ſuch as are found guilty of this crime; and that their names are taken out of the book of life, and out of the holy city. To reconcile this with his general ſcheme, or *the ſalvation of all men*, he agrees with his *friend* that carries on the *dialogues* with him, in theſe words: 'Though his part in the heavenly 'city may be forfeited, ſo that he may never become one of thoſe 'who ſhall reign therein, nor yet have a conſtant dwelling there; 'he may, nevertheleſs, enter as a worſhipper, and a ſubject of 'the great king; and may drink of the water of life; feed on 'the fruits of the tree of life, and be healed by its leaves; and 'be one of the happy inhabitants of the new earth, which God 'will create.'‡ Mr. W. pretends to hold the literal ſenſe of this awful threatening; that 'his part is taken out of the heavenly city, and that he never is one that reigns therein.' In the next breath, Mr. W, contradicts this. For if 'he drinks of the water 'of life, eats of the tree of life, & is a worſhipper of the *great King;*' what more in the heavenly city can be deſired? In this caſe it is all one

* P. 184. † Ibid. ‡ P. 183.

one whether he is an inhabitant of *the new earth* or *new heaven*. Therefore, Mr. W. reduces the threatening to nothing, but pretends to hold its literal ſenſe. So he pretends to take this literally, 'Theſe ſhall go away into everlaſting puniſhment.' Matt. xxv. 46. This he ſays is for ages of ages, and will come to an end. Likewiſe all the awful threatenings of this kind, all the plagues and curſes of God's law, he ſays are ſtrictly executed on the damned; their puniſhment, however, will laſt only for a time. But if all that the law of God threatens, is ſtrictly executed on the damned, then do they receive their full deſert. For the law threatens no more nor no leſs than what is juſt. So the damned ſuffer, Mr. W. argues, according to ſtrict juſtice.

3. One argument he uſes to diſprove endleſs puniſhment, is, that men do not deſerve it; ſuch puniſhment is unjuſt; but the puniſhment taught in his ſcheme is juſt and equal. Thus he argues, that 'limited puniſhment is ſo juſt, equitable, reaſonable, 'and evident; that it is much more calculated to produce be-'lief, and conſequently more effectual to deſtroy falſe hopes of 'eſcaping it, and alſo to check that daring preſumption, which 'riſes out of the idea of *endleſs miſery*; than can be found in 'the contrary doctrine. *Endleſs puniſhment* ſeems to ſhock 'tender minds,'* Again he argues, 'That *endleſs damnation* 'is too unnatural to be believed, and that *limited puniſhments*, 'being more reaſonable, ſeem more certain.'† He pretends, therefore, to have great advantage againſt his opponents. Becauſe of the puniſhment he aſſigns the damned; which is 'ſo 'juſt, equitable, and reaſonable;' while that taught by his opponents is *unnatural* and ſhocking. But Mr. Wincheſter's way of arguing, in this caſe, includes the ſtrongeſt and moſt ſolemn profeſſion of holding that the damned ſuffer *a juſt* and *equitable* puniſhment, to the extent of their deſert and no more.

4. Mr. W. holds that ſuch as blaſpheme againſt the Holy Ghoſt are entirely cut off from pardon, and that they do actually ſuffer *the ſecond death*. 'The ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt,' he ſays, 'is an offence of that kind, that, either owing to its uncom-'mon malignity, as is moſt likely, or ſome other cauſe, expoſes 'the guilty perſon to the age of judgment, from which he 'cannot eſcape by repentance, pardon, and ſprinkling of 'the blood of Chriſt, as other ſinners may; neither can he at 'preſent be born of the Spirit, to which he has done deſpite; nor 'can he be reclaimed by any poſſible means, in this age, or in 'the age that is to ſucceed this, but is inevitably bound over to 'ſuffer the inconceivable torments of the ſecond death, or lake 'of fire and brimſtone after the day of judgment.'‡

Mr.

* P. 147. † P. 148. ‡ P. 62.

Mr. W's *friend*, that holds the *dialogue* with him, states the objection taken from Matt. xii. 31, 32. Mark iii. 28, 29. Heb. v. 4, 5. 6, and x. 26 to 29, in these words, 'Here is a sin for 'which there is no forgiveness, neither in this world or in that 'to come; which shall not be forgiven at all; he that commit-'teth it hath never forgiveness, is in danger of eternal damnation; '—having sinned wilfully and maliciously, after receiving the 'knowledge of the truth, to such no more sacrifice for sins re-'maineth; judgment and fiery indignation are his certain portion; 'he is an adversary and must be devoured: a sorer punishment 'than death without mercy awaits him, for that he hath trodden 'under foot the Son of God.'* Mr. Winchester does not deny the least part of this objection, he grants the whole of it, just as it is stated. He says, in reply to it, 'As when Nebuchadnezzar 'told Daniel his dream, he was astonished for one hour——; 'much more must all those be, who read and consider these 'dreadful threatenings, which must surely come upon all those 'who have sinned in the manner described.'† He says again to his *friend*, referring to the same objection, 'There is no kind 'of dispute between us, respecting the certainty of the punish-'ment of such; in this we both agree: he that sinneth against 'the Holy Ghost, is in danger of eternal damnation, or judg-'ment, or the second death. The question is, 'Shall there ever 'come a time, when the second death, or lake of fire, shall no 'more exist?'‡ He then goes on, attempting to show that the time will come, when these shall no more exist. He therefore expressly agrees to this, that the blasphemer against the Holy Ghost is forever cut off from pardon—he hath never forgiveness, neither in this world, nor in the world to come—no more sacrifice for his sins remaineth. This shows that his object is to take this threatening and all others in their literal sense.

It is here remarkable, Mr. Winchester is not speaking merely of the just desert of the sin above mentioned; arguing, at the same time, that men never do commit it, and therefore never suffer the threatened punishment. 'We are sure,' he says, 'that 'the Scribes and Pharisees of our Saviour's time, who blasphem-'ously ascribed his miracles to the power of the devil, did, in the 'most direct and undeniable manner, commit that sin,'§ the sin against the Holy Ghost. These sinners, therefore, according to Mr. Winchester, were wholly shut out from pardon, and the second death inflicted upon them.

Mr. W. here argues, in two respects, that such as commit this sin suffer the extent of their desert. They are never forgiven, no

* P. 60. † P. 61. ‡ P. 62, 63. § P. 61.

no more ſacrifice for their ſins remaineth; they accordingly ſuffer all that ſtrict juſtice demands. Again, they ſuffer the ſecond death. None ever pretended that the execution of ſtrict juſtice was any thing more than the ſecond death. Thoſe, who have held to endleſs puniſhment, have always conſidered the ſecond death to be the full wages of ſin, and the diſplay of ſtrict juſtice. And Mr. W. no where intimates that the ſecond death is ſomething leſs than the damned deſerve, but ſays things right the contrary. He alſo ſays, as we have ſeen, that the diſpute between him and his opponents, is, that the damned do not deſerve endleſs death. When they have ſuffered all they deſerve, then will they be freed from the ſecond death; or this death will then be at an end, and not before. Theſe things we have ſeen fairly argued by him.

Hence, Mr. W. aſſerts, and ſeveral ways argues, and in a very decided manner, that the damned ſuffer the utmoſt of their deſert. This ſentiment appears as plain as almoſt any thing in his book. Should ſome perſons queſtion that he holds to it, they may as well queſtion that he holds all men will be ſaved. Again,

5. Mr. Wincheſter holds, or his arguments imply the ſame, that ſome men ſuffer, in this world, all the demand juſtice has againſt them.

What Chriſt ſaid of Judas, 'Good were it for that man if he 'had never been born,' Mr. W. explains and anſwers as follows: 'There are a thouſand circumſtances into which the 'children of Adam fall, that make their caſe infinitely worſe 'than though they had never been born, even without ſuppoſing 'a ſtate of future puniſhment at all.'*—After citing Luke xxi. 23, and Matt. xxiii. 27 to 31, he ſays, 'Who would not, a 'thouſand times, chooſe rather never to have been born, than 'even to ſee, far leſs experience, the miſeries which came upon 'Jeruſalem and its inhabitants? Would it not have been better 'for mothers never to have been born, than to have killed and 'eaten their own children in the ſiege? And would it not have 'been better for the children never to have been born, than to 'have been food for their mothers?'† In connection with theſe aſſertions, and ſeveral other inſtances to illuſtrate them, as he pretends, he ſays, 'With what amazing propriety might Chriſt 'ſay of Judas, the traitor, 'Good were it for that man, if he had "never been born!' even upon the ſuppoſition that his torments 'are not deſigned to continue while God exiſts.'‡

To ſet Judas out of hell, Mr. W. would make heaven a place of miſery. The ſaints in heaven undoubtedly did 'ſee the miſ-'eries which came upon Jeruſalem and its inhabitants.' Which

ſight,

* P. 82. † P. 85. ‡ P. 84.

ſight, he ſays, made their caſe a thouſand times worſe than if they 'had never been born.' This we ſhall hereafter conſider. What he makes ſome of mankind ſuffer in this world, now comes before us. And thoſe 'children' or infants, made 'food for their 'mothers,' whoſe caſe 'would have been better if they had never 'been born;' if theſe did not ſuffer all they deſerve, in this world, let Mr. W. ſhow, on his own ground, what more they did deſerve; or what degree and duration of miſery infants do deſerve; eſpecially as he denies that ſin deſerves endleſs puniſhment. But thoſe who ſuffer to an infinite degree in this world, it is impoſſible to ſhow that they deſerve ſtill more, even on the ground of holding to the utmoſt deſert of ſin. Thoſe 'thouſand 'circumſtances into which the children of Adam fall,' he tells of, 'that make their caſe *infinitely worſe* than though they had 'never been born, without ſuppoſing a ſtate of future puniſhment 'at all,' make it impoſſible they ſhould deſerve ſtill more, on any plan whatever. What they ſuffer only in this world, makes it infinitely worſe than if they had not been born, or had never exiſted. This certainly muſt be a balance to the evil of ſin, allowing of it to be infinite; or it cannot be ſaid that ſtrict juſtice demands further ſuffering, either in this or the coming world. The *infinitely worſe*, which Mr. W. here ſtates, is not infinite in duration, therefore muſt be infinite in degree. And it cannot be ſhown that any ſinner ought to ſuffer more than to an *infinite degree*. This is what he makes ſome men ſuffer in this world, and in a thouſand inſtances.

It will now be objected that Mr. W. does not mean ſtrictly, or unlimitedly, by *infinitely worſe;* but only to a very great degree.

Anſwer. He gives no intimation, nor ſays any thing in connection, ſo as to decide the point, but what he means an unlimited degree—unlimitedly worſe than if they had never been born. This he ſays in his zeal to ſave Judas. It *may* be ſuppoſed he means not ſtrictly, but only a great degree worſe. So it may be ſuppoſed he means, by the ſalvation of all men, not ſtrictly all men, but only a great number, or nearly all. It is granted, in the next ſentence after *infinitely worſe*, he ſays, '*A thouſand* '*times worſe.*' But there is not a neceſſary connection between the two ſentences, ſo as to decide that he means the ſame by *infinitely*, as by *a thouſand*. To ſay the moſt, therefore, his expreſſion *may* be taken in the unlimited ſenſe. Which in a thouſand caſes is to make men ſuffer to an infinite degree, in this world.

Beſides,

Besides, if we allow the objection, that Mr. W. intends only a great degree worse, by *infinitely worse*; as he denies sin deserves endless misery, it is impossible for him to show that such as suffer this *infinitely worse*, do not suffer all they deserve, in the present life. For if he uses the word *infinitely* in a limited sense, it is then a bold figure, to come as near to that which is strictly unlimited, as any word can, and not actually express it. So Mr. W. could say nothing more as to the sufferings of men, in this world, unless he should say they suffer strictly to an infinite degree; and he denies that they deserve to suffer to an infinite degree, or to infinite duration. Therefore, on his own plan, he could not express that men suffer the full demerit of their sins, in this world, in stronger terms than he does.

It is not only part of mankind, but the whole of them that Mr. W. would make to suffer in this manner. When he says, 'There are a thousand circumstances into which the children of 'Adam fall, that make their case infinitely worse,' &c. this is making of it so general or universal, it appears difficult if not impracticable to find an exception of one individual. He also says, 'Who would not, a thousand times, choose rather never 'to have been born, than even to see, far less experience the 'miseries which came upon Jerusalem and its inhabitants?'— Only 'to see' the misery of others, therefore, occasions such misery to him that seeth it. But taking this with the other case just mentioned, and the whole race of men would seem to be involved in infinite misery, while in the present life. Or certainly Mr. W. makes them all suffer, while in this life, equal to what he calls their full desert.

And he asserts and argues this sentiment, in a number of instances; so that he might escape this most awful threatening to Judas, 'Good were it for that man if he had never been born.' We shall see in one instance more. Job and Jeremiah, he says, cursed the day in which they were born, not because they 'had 'any fear of future damnation,'* they had then 'full assurance 'of eternal life;'* but because of their present pains and tortures, being greater than they could bear. He not only says this, but he justifies them, in cursing the day of their birth. 'His *friend* objects, 'That both Job and Jeremiah passionately ex-'claimed, and, through sorrow, uttered such rash words, as, in 'their cooler moments, they repented of; and therefore what 'they spoke of themselves cannot wholly set aside the objection.' —'But Christ, though under great sorrows himself, saw the 'case of Judas so deplorable, that he expressed himself thus re-'specting

* P. 83, 84.

'ſpecting him; which was the ſober truth, without exaggera-
'tion.'* To this Mr. W. anſwers: 'We do not find that Job
'or Jeremiah ever recanted, in their cooler moments, what they
'uttered in their ſorrows.'† He then goes on to cite Matt. xxiv. 19. Mark xiii. 17. and other ſcriptures, and argues from thence that they had no occaſion for recanting or repenting, becauſe they had curſed their day. Their preſent ſorrows were ſo great as to juſtify them in ſo doing, notwithſtanding they then had 'full aſſurance' of an endleſs ſtate of happineſs, after death. Whether, in the moſt trying ſtate whatever, men can be juſtified for curſing their day, and ſo curſing the providence of God, is a caſe for Mr. W. to ſolve. But if theſe men can be juſtified for curſing their day, then they had a good reaſon for curſing their day; which good reaſon will hold a good one forever; time or duration can neither wear it out nor alter it. And if they had a good reaſon for curſing their day, when in a view of eternal life, or taking their preſent and future exiſtence together, then they have this moment a good reaſon to curſe their day, ſo will have to eternity. As, therefore, this *good reaſon* is becauſe of their great miſery, it argues their miſery to be ſo great that their exiſtence, on the whole, is an evil—a curſe inſtead of a bleſſing. Therefore, their miſery ſuffered in time, overbalances their good enjoyed in eternity. Hence, this their evil ſuffered in time, as it is greater than an eternal good, muſt be an infinite evil. Elſe how could their reaſon for curſing their day, becauſe of their great miſery, be good? or how could they be juſtified in ſo doing?

The day that gave them birth, gave them their exiſtence. To curſe the day of their birth, is to curſe their exiſtence. To curſe their exiſtence, is to declare it an evil. To juſtify them for their declaring their exiſtence an evil, is ſaying their exiſtence is an evil. And it is an evil becauſe of the miſery they ſuffer in time. The happineſs they have in eternity does not make their exiſtence, on the whole, a good or a bleſſing; it is ſtill a curſe, and juſtly to be curſed. Therefore, the curſe they endure in time is greater than the bleſſing they enjoy in eternity. Therefore, becauſe they enjoy eternal happineſs, their miſery in time, which is greater than their eternal happineſs, is infinitely great. All this Mr. Wincheſter ſays, by ſaying that Job and Jeremiah did right in curſing the day in which they were born; and when they had full aſſurance of eternal happineſs.

Mr. W. ſeems to be aware of this abſurdity, and attempts to eſcape it, by ſaying that if Job and Jeremiah had died in the womb,

* P. 84, 85. † Ibid.

womb, or been born without life, they then would immediately have entered into reſt. So he ſays, 'Had Judas died before he 'had been born, and periſhed from his mother's womb, he would 'never have ſinned, far leſs betrayed Chriſt; he would have en-'tered into peace immediately, 'where the wicked ceaſe from "troubling, and where the weary are at reſt:' In this caſe, he 'would have eſcaped the judgment that came upon him, and 'would have had more reſt than thoſe who ſhould live in all the 'affluence of life two thouſand years.'*

A moſt miſerable ſhift he here makes. For, 1. He goes upon a blind ſuppoſition. That men have rational ſouls, capable of entering into eternal reſt, before they are born, is an opinion without evidence. And they muſt have rational ſouls before their bodies are formed in the womb, or whether they ever have human bodies, or not, according to Mr. W's plan. For, if the body is firſt formed in the womb, or ſoul and body together, it is natural to conclude that this body, at leaſt, muſt be born. Then all Mr. W's reaſoning on this point comes to nothing. 'Good were it for that man if he had never been born:' which implies that it had been good for Judas if his body had never come into being. And, that his ſoul could have had a being without a body, is ſuch a blind ſuppoſition as will not do to build our faith upon, for the things of eternity. 2. To ſay that Judas might have eſcaped the threatened evil, on Mr. W's plan, is reducing the threatening to nothing. It would have been good for all men, on his plan, had they never been born. 3. To aſſert that Job and Jeremiah ſuffered to ſuch a degree, in this life, then to deviſe a way how they might have eſcaped this ſuffering, is nothing to his purpoſe. A thouſand ways may be deviſed, how they might have eſcaped; and what then? If they ſuffered this evil, they ſuffered it. If their being, on the whole, was a curſe, it was worſe than no being. If their evil, ſuffered in time, was more than a balance to their eternal happineſs, then they ſuffered, in time, an infinite evil. And no one pretends that the threatening to Judas contained more than an infinite or endleſs evil. 4. To try to evade the awful threatening to Judas, by ſaying that Job and Jeremiah, while in time, ſuffered the ſame; then, to make this out, to magnify their ſufferings to an infinite degree, is a twofold abſurdity. But, to deviſe ſome way to palliate for ſuch abſurdity, is to make it more abſurd. 5. To ſay that the ſouls of men, before they are united to their bodies, or before they are born, may enter into reſt or into heaven; and, for proof, to bring this, 'Where the wicked ceaſe from trouble,

'ling,

* P. 83.

'ling, and where the weary are at reſt,' is a direct contradiction. For this is ſaying that the ſouls of the wicked, as ſuch, do enter into reſt or into heaven; which Mr. W. himſelf denies. Their bodies reſt in the grave, being paſt feeling; which is the meaning of the above words.

After every ſhift and turn Mr. W. can make, he muſt allow that the ſufferings of Job and Jeremiah were the occaſion of increaſing their happineſs in heaven—the occaſion of endleſs good to them. But if their temporal ſufferings were ſo great as to exceed this endleſs good; then were their temporal ſufferings infinitely great. Now, in this caſe, if they did not ſuffer the utmoſt of their deſert, on Mr. W's plan, let it be ſhown what they did deſerve. And he appears to make all men ſuffer, in this life, the extent of their deſert. Thoſe *thouſand* caſes, he tells of, may apply to the whole human race. Eſpecially when they ſuffer the agonies of death, and before their ſouls quit their bodies, it appears they muſt, in his ſcheme, all ſuffer the full wages of their ſins.

Thus Mr. W. makes all men, while in this world, pay the debt they owe to divine juſtice. And ſuch as continue obſtinate and impenitent, he would have them ſent to hell, to pay the ſame debt the ſecond time. The damned in hell he conſigns over, as we have ſeen, to ſtrict juſtice, to judgment without mercy, and to the ſecond death; where they are never forgiven, and where no more ſacrifice for ſin remaineth. What is ſtill more extraordinary, if poſſible, in his ſcheme; after ſome men have ſuffered one infinite evil, in this, he makes them ſuffer another infinite evil, in the next world. Some wicked men, he ſays, endure the ſame degree of pain and torment, in this life, as did Job and Jeremiah. For he takes the caſe of theſe men to illuſtrate *the thouſand* other caſes, into which the children of Adam fall. So the caſe of thoſe wicked men that died in the ſiege of Jeruſalem, he ranks under the ſame head. Theſe things we have already ſeen. Now, theſe wicked men, after they have once ſuffered to an infinite degree, in this life, and are ſtill impenitent till they die; Mr. W. ſays of them, 'They ſhall hereafter ſuffer '*infinitely* greater inconveniencies, by being caſt into hell.'* Again, he ſays, 'The ſtate here (of a certain caſe in this life) 'deſcribed by Solomon, is *infinitely* better than the damnation 'of hell, though limited by certain periods.'† His own account, therefore, of hell, is a place where they ſuffer to an infinite degree. And this he ſays, not by a figure, but in its literal ſenſe. So he makes the wicked ſuffer one *infinite*, in this life, then ſends

* P. 61. † P. 87.

ſends them to hell to ſuffer another *infinite!* And even glories in it, that he can hereby, as he pretends, get rid of that moſt awful threatening to Judas. But, it belongs to him to ſhow, that the damned, eſpecially, after they have ſuffered two *infinites*, have not ſuffered all they deſerve; when, at the ſame time, he denies ſin to be an infinite evil.

The following remarks upon the foregoing, with a few more quotations from his book; may now bring Mr. W's ſcheme into view.

1. There is one fatal contradiction running through the whole. Many of our race, if not all, ſuffer the utmoſt of their deſert, and yet all men are ſaved wholly by grace, and by the merits of Chriſt alone. Theſe two points he labours to eſtabliſh, as we have ſeen, and he keeps them up throughout his book. They cannot both be true. Grace is favour ſhown to the ill deſerving. Grace is the beſtowment of good on ſuch as deſerve nothing but evil. Grace is a free gift, entirely a free gift, and to the unworthy. Such as are ſaved by grace are forgiven. Such as are ſaved by grace only, are wholly forgiven; they atone for no part of their ill deſert, neither by ſuffering nor in any other way. And ſuch as are ſaved by grace alone, or ſuch as are wholly forgiven, they ſuffer no part of what they deſerve. Again, ſuch as ſuffer all they deſerve, are forgiven no part of what they deſerve. For, as they ſuffer all, no part remains to be forgiven. In this caſe, it is impoſſible they ſhould be forgiven. But, if they are wholly forgiven, it is impoſſible they ſhould ſuffer. It is impoſſible they ſhould be forgiven all they deſerve, and, at the ſame time, ſuffer all they deſerve. When men have ſuffered all they deſerve, they ſtand even with divine juſtice; nothing more can juſtly be inflicted upon them. Neither, in this caſe, can any thing be forgiven; ſuffering has atoned for the whole.

Now, how can Mr. Wincheſter ſo often aſſert, and argue, in the moſt decided manner, directly againſt himſelf? But there is no way for him to avoid the contradiction. Holding to future puniſhment, as he does, and he cannot deny that the damned ſuffer according to ſtrict juſtice. Scripture ſo clearly eſtabliſhes this doctrine, that is, that juſtice is fully executed on the damned, it cannot be denied, without openly violating the truth. As, therefore, he holds to limited puniſhment, there is no way but for him to deny that ſin deſerves endleſs puniſhment. Then again, as he holds all men are ſaved, he muſt hold that all men are ſaved by grace; or deny the plaineſt part of ſcripture. But when they have ſuffered for the whole of their ill deſert, be it

more

more or leſs, they have completely atoned for their ſins, by their own ſuffering. In this caſe, grace cannot interpoſe. And, in this caſe, to ſay, that they are ſaved by grace, completes the contradiction. It is happy for the world, on one account, that Mr. W. has put his ſcheme into writing. It can now be ſeen wherein it deſtroys itſelf.

Some would now object, That the ſufferings of the damned are for their good, to lead them to repentance; they juſtly deſerve no more than to lead them to repentance; and this is grace, even the damnation of hell, and beſtowed in conſequence of the death of Chriſt.

Anſwer. (1.) The objection itſelf ſays, All that the damned deſerve is grace; which is a contradiction. Grace deſerved, is not grace. (2.) If this be all that ſinners deſerve, then it is juſtice in God, or juſtice requires him to lead ſinners to repentance; either by the torments of hell, or in ſome other way. Which is not grace but juſtice. (3.) If ſinners juſtly deſerve no more than to lead them to repentance, then, when they have repented, either in this world or in hell, they have anſwered all the demands of juſtice. Accordingly, repentance would anſwer the demands of juſtice, and without a Mediator. And no reaſon can be given, from the bible, why the torments of hell ſhould not be inflicted, without a Mediator. Therefore, the laſt and moſt powerful mean, univerſaliſts tell of, may be uſed; ſo as to lead all to repentance, and anſwer all the demands of juſtice, without a Mediator. Hence, that ſcheme which would ſet aſide the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, making the repentance of ſinners anſwer in its ſtead, cannot be true. Further attention will be paid to the above objection, or ſentiment it contains, in the next Letter.

It will again be objected, That after the damned have ſuffered to the full demand of juſtice, they ſtill keep ſinning, and therefore deſerve to be ſtill continued in hell. On this account, nothing but grace can deliver and ſave them.

Anſwer. It was ſhown in Let. VII. Part I, that if ſinners pay the debt they owe to divine juſtice, provided they can do it, either by their own ſufferings or in any other way; they are then acquitted by the law, and ſtand upon the ground of juſtified perſons. In this caſe, it is no more an act of grace to give them repentance and ſalvation, than for God to keep holy angels from ſinning. Again, there is no ſcripture evidence that the damned are continued under their torments, for the ſins they commit in hell. The ſentence that confines them in hell, is limited wholly to their ill deſert for their evil deeds done in the body, or in this world. For this, ſee in Let. III. Part IV.

Thoſe

Theſe objections, however, are not ſtated and anſwered, becauſe there is the leaſt room, even to ſuſpect that Mr. Winchester can relieve himſelf from the above contradiction. He labours the point, to ſhow how he holds to ſalvation, by pardon, by forgiveneſs, and by grace alone; which is wholly through the merits of Chriſt. And that the damned, by their ſufferings, atone for no part of their guilt, nor do the leaſt thing towards meriting their ſalvation, or delivering themſelves from hell. Again, that the damned ſuffer all they deſerve, and of courſe atone for the whole of their guilt; he could not have expreſſed this in ſtronger terms. But this is not the only contradiction in his book. We therefore remark,

2. Speaking of a juſt recompenſe of reward hereafter, he ſays, 'The current doctrine of endleſs miſery, deſtroys this rule of 'equity and proportion.'* 'Endleſs damnation is too unnatural 'to be believed, limited puniſhments are more reaſonable.'† 'Endleſs puniſhment ſeems to ſhock tender minds.'‡ This rule 'of equity' is deſtroyed, becauſe, 'A child of ten years old,' he ſays, 'will remain in miſery as long as the moſt perſecuting ty'rant;' alſo, endleſs damnation exceeds the deſert of the greateſt ſinner, 'limited puniſhments are more reaſonable.' Now, ſee the glaring contradiction. Thoſe miſerable children, he tells of, who were 'food for their mothers, in the ſiege at Jeruſalem, had 'better never been born.' And Mr. W. claſſes them with thoſe *thouſands* whoſe caſe is infinitely worſe than nonexiſtence; who ſuffer an infinite evil in this life. Can a finite being, a child, perhaps five years old or under, ſuffer an infinite evil, in time? Is this 'too unnatural to be believed,' or not? And how does this infinite evil, ſuffered by this child, agree with his limited puniſhments, which are more reaſonable? Eſpecially the abſurdity of adding two *infinites* together, one endured in this world and another in hell, by the ſame perſons; does this 'ſhock 'tender minds,' or does it not?

Mr. W. is determined at all hazards, it ſeems, to deliver Judas from endleſs miſery. Accordingly, he makes thouſands of mankind infinitely miſerable, while in the preſent life. It is as ſhameful and diſtreſſing, in itſelf conſidered, both to mothers and children, to offer them to Moloch, as to make them food for their mothers. And how many thouſands of infants have been ſacrificed to their idols? When Carthage was beſieged by the Romans, in the days of Nero, the inhabitants of this devoted city ſacrificed 300 of their infants, at one time, to appeaſe the anger of their gods. In any connection excepting this of Judas,

* P. 5. † P. 148. ‡ P. 147.

Mr. W. would, it appears, make the case of these infants most desirable.—That they went directly to happiness; and that the evil they suffered here, was nothing, compared to their endless good hereafter. But now he makes them eternally happy, then their existence worse than none, then limited punishments are more reasonable, then endless punishment shocks tender minds. Why does he not first show, whether these *tender minds* are tenderly affected towards truth, or towards falsehood?

3. After all his pretensions of love to men, and desire for the happiness of each one, and the greatest happiness of heaven, we see what he makes of heaven. A place where they may forever curse their day! according to the language of Satan himself. Job and Jeremiah, he says, looked forward and saw what heaven is, viewed the evil and the good together, and did right in cursing their day. Therefore they may forever look back, and see the evil and the good together, and do right in cursing their day.

Especially, we may remark that notable expression of his: '*Who would not, a thousand times, choose rather never to* '*have been born, than even to see, far less experience, the* '*miseries that came upon Jerusalem and its inhabitants, in* '*the time of the siege?*' And Moses, the prophets, the apostles, and all heaven did *even see* this great and awful event. Hence they may, Mr. W. says, a thousand times choose rather never to have been born. This is what he makes of heaven.

4. Instead of promoting the fear of God, and submission to his holy will, as he every where professes, he leads the way to justify all the murmuring and rebellion, that ever did or ever will take place. If a man can be justified for cursing his day, at one time, he can be justified for it at another, and so on, at all times, and under all circumstances. And if a man can be justified for cursing his day, by the same rule, he can be justified should he curse the providence of God or the law of God. But Mr. W. justifies Job and Jeremiah for cursing their day.

In doing this, Mr. W. overlooks some of the plainest things of scripture. 'We do not find,' he says, 'that Job or Jeremiah 'ever recanted, in their cooler moments, what they uttered in 'their sorrows.'* His meaning is, they never repented, in their cooler moments, for cursing their day, while under their extreme sorrows. He hence argues that they had no occasion of repenting for this conduct. But when the Almighty comes to reason with Job, Job says, 'I have heard of thee by the hearing of the 'ear: but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself,

* P. 84.

ſelf, and repent in duſt and aſhes.' Now, as Job's repentance is here recorded, undoubtedly his crime, for which he repented, is to be found in the ſame connection. For this is univerſally the caſe throughout the bible. And if Job's curſing his day does not ſtand againſt him as his crime, for which he repented, what does? If, to curſe the day of one's birth, is not murmuring againſt the providence of God, what is? For the ſame kind of conduct, the pſalmiſt confeſſes to the LORD, 'So fooliſh was 'I, and ignorant: I was as a beaſt before thee:' That is, moſt ſtupid and perverſe. In the ſame light, ſcripture every where ſtates the ſin of complaining of the things that afflict us, eſpecially of opening our mouths in curſing. Hence it is moſt natural to conclude, that Job has particular reference to this ſo aggravated ſin, when he ſays, 'I abhor myſelf, and repent in duſt and 'aſhes.' This gives concluſive evidence that Jeremiah repented in like manner. And, it was after he was put into the ſtocks, at the high gate of Benjamin, when he curſed his day, that he wrote his book of Lamentations. Here, among other things, he ſays, 'It is of the LORD's mercies that we are not conſumed, 'becauſe his compaſſions fail not.'* Inſtead of complaining againſt God's righteous dealings, he acknowledges that his mercy alone had ſaved him, and others, from utter and eternal ruin. —But if Mr. Wincheſter has the boldneſs to argue right againſt ſome of the plaineſt things of ſcripture, what can he not do? If he has the hardineſs to lead the way, in juſtification of all murmuring and rebellion againſt God, what can he not do to carry his point?

5. Mr. Wincheſter profeſſes, eminently, to teach the humiliating doctrines of the croſs; namely, ſelf-denial, ſalvation by grace alone, ſalvation entirely a free gift, and the pride of man laid in the duſt. That this is his high profeſſion is evident, from paſſages already cited. But his whole ſcheme is directly the reverſe. Nothing tends more to gratify the infernal proud feelings of hard hearted ſinners, than for them to be told, their preſent ſufferings place them upon a level with divine juſtice. And Mr. W. ſays, thouſands ſuffer *infinite evil*, in this life. Infinite evil is all God has threatened, to be inflicted on ſinful men, either in time or eternity; and ſtrict juſtice demands no more. The abſurdity of a finite being's ſuffering an infinite evil, in time, the deceitful heart, if poſſible, will ſwallow down. Stupid ſinners will, at the ſame time, be diſpoſed to magnify every ſlight pain, they endure, to an infinite degree. And, in their falſe imagination, keep themſelves upon a level with divine juſtice. Mr. W. has

* Chap. 3. 22.

has also led the way, to make sinners believe God is indebted to them; by telling them they suffer that, in this world, which infinitely exceeds what he calls a state of eternal happiness. Believing in this flattering scheme, they must suppose God will never, to eternity, fully repay them for their sufferings; should he even take them to heaven immediately after death. Should God, however, first send them down to hell, there to suffer another infinite evil; this will accordingly increase their debt against God, and their demand upon his justice: Especially, should they, in hell, by repentance, that mighty work of supererogation, complete the debt due to them, which the Almighty never can pay. Thus, on this plan, must they expect, from hell, to rise to heaven, and rise above Jehovah himself; forever holding Jehovah as their debtor or servant.

Sin ever disposes sinners, in a moral view, to believe that they are '*rich, and increased with goods, and to have need of nothing.*'* It is immaterial in what way this *increase with goods* is made; whether by suffering or by good works. Suffering the curse of the law, or infinite suffering, which is the same, satisfies divine justice, as well as the perfect obedience of angels. Mr. W. has put sinners in a way to make a rapid *increase with goods*: Twofold satisfaction to divine justice, or a twofold debt in their own favour; one infinite demand here, and another in hell. What sinner, in his scheme, will be afraid of hell? And, as each one may come out of hell when he repents, or when he chooses; and thus, in his infernal pride, triumph over infinite justice!

6. Mr. W. holds that the torments of hell are suited, far better than any thing in this life, to lead the damned to repentance. Because these torments far exceed every thing in this life; they are 'continued longer,' he says, 'and heavier.' And 'God is 'able,' he adds, 'to subdue and bring down the proud and most 'rebellious, in another state, by means that may be used effec-'tually there, though they could not be used here.'† Now how does this compare with what we have just seen? To an infinite degree, he makes thousands suffer, in this life. And is not God able, if suffering will do it, to bring all men to repentance in their infancy? God is able, Mr. W. has just said, to make infants suffer before they die, so as it would been better if they had not been born. But, let Mr. W. have his argument, for a moment, and what becomes of the *effectual power* of divine grace, in the hearts of men? This, with other things in his book, we shall see in the next Letter.

All that universalists can say about the torments of hell, being so well suited to humble and subdue the hearts of the damned, is mere

* Rev. 3. 17. † P. 158.

mere aſſertion without ſcripture evidence; or it is aſſerting right oppoſite to the light of ſcripture. We know that the greateſt ſuffering, in this life, eſpecially of thoſe in the ſiege of Jeruſalem, inſtead of breaking the pride of their hearts, produced the oppoſite effect. And theſe moſt awful ſufferings are ſet forth, in ſcripture, to illuſtrate the ſtate of the damned.

I am, &c.

LETTER II.

Briefly ſtating the contradictory arguments, uſed by Dr. Chauncy, and the other writers in this ſcheme.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

THE things intended in this Letter, we ſhall ſee, from the following remarks.

1. Dr. Chauncy falls into the ſame fatal contradiction, copied by Mr. Wincheſter. The Doctor holds that the damned are puniſhed according to ſtrict juſtice, and that they are finally delivered and ſaved wholly by grace.

The damned, he ſays, are 'miſerable, in proportion to the 'moral depravity they have contracted in this world.'* 'They 'muſt be unavoidably miſerable, notwithſtanding the infinite 'benevolence of the Deity, and to a great degree of ſeverity, 'God only knows how long, in proportion to the number and 'greatneſs of their vices.'† 'What fruit had ye in thoſe things 'whereof ye are now aſhamed? For the end of thoſe things is 'death, notwithſtanding the abounding of the grace of God. 'For the wages of ſin is death; but the gift of God is eternal 'life, through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord; that is, if men continue 'the ſervants of ſin, the wages they ſhall receive before the gift 'through Chriſt is conferred on them will be the ſecond death.'‡

On this, Dr. Edwards remarks, 'If ſome men ſuffer that pun-'iſhment which is the wages of ſin, they doubtleſs ſuffer all 'which they deſerve. No man deſerves more than his *wages*.'§

Dr. Chauncy ſays again, 'In the collective ſenſe, they (the 'damned) will be tormented for ages of ages; though ſome of 'them only ſhould be tormented through the whole of this period, 'and the reſt variouſly, as to time, *in proportion to their de-'ſerts*.'‖ Dr. C. cannot here mean, 'In proportion to their 'deſerts,'

* P. 9. *Salvation of all men.* † Ibid. P. 10. ‡ P. 90.
§ *Edwards againſt Chauncy*, P. 1. ‖ P. 307.

'deſerts,' according to the plan of divine grace; thereby intending to plead ſome abatement of ſtrict juſtice. He intimates no ſuch thing. And he ſays, 'Notwithſtanding the infinite benevolence of the Deity—notwithſtanding the abounding of the 'grace of God.' Thus he argues, that the torments of the damned are not abated by divine grace, neither are they delivered from thoſe torments by the abounding grace of God, till they have ſuffered in proportion to their deſerts, or all they deſerve.

Neither can it be objected, 'By a puniſhment in proportion 'to their deſerts—in proportion to the moral depravity they have 'contracted in this world—in proportion to the number and 'greatneſs of their vices,' that Dr. C. meant not a puniſhment equal to ſtrict juſtice; but one which has a due proportion to the various perſons, with reſpect to one another, who are the ſubjects of this puniſhment. The Doctor directly denies this. All that die in their ſins, and of courſe are ſentenced to the torments of hell, with reſpect to forgiveneſs, he claſſes with ſuch as blaſpheme againſt the Holy Ghoſt. Of theſe, he ſays, 'If they 'are not ſaved, till after they have paſſed through theſe torments, '(which, he ſays they actually do paſs through) they have never 'been forgiven, in the ſenſe, in which our Saviour is here ſpeaking of forgiveneſs. The divine law has taken its courſe; nor 'has any intervening pardon prevented the full execution of the 'threatened penalty on them. Forgiveneſs, ſtrictly and literally 'ſpeaking has not been granted them.' Even their ſalvation, as 'it is poſterior to their having undergone the torments of hell, 'is not the effect of that goſpel-forgiveneſs our Saviour is treating 'about.'* By this 'goſpel-forgiveneſs,' he intends forgiveneſs before they are ſent to hell. Such as ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, he ſays, cannot poſſibly be forgiven, previous to this. And he here argues that theſe are never forgiven. The words in Mark iii. 29, he explains as thoſe do who hold to endleſs puniſhment; that is, the blaſphemers againſt the Holy Ghoſt are *never forgiven*. Of courſe, the damned, all of them, are never forgiven, on his plan. 'The divine law has taken its courſe; nor has any 'intervening pardon prevented the full execution of the threat'ened penalty on them.'

'The divine law,' he calls, 'the moral law.' On 'the foot of 'this law,' or of 'mere law,' he ſays, 'no man can be juſtified.'† Therefore, if this law, by which no man can be juſtified, has its courſe on the damned, and the threatened penalty is fully executed on them; they ſuffer according to ſtrict juſtice, they ſuffer all they deſerve. In the Doctor's own words, 'Forgiveneſs, ſtrictly 'and

* P. 336, 337. † P. 43.

and literally speaking has not been granted them.' How could Dr. C. have argued and asserted more decidedly, that the damned suffer the utmost of their ill desert?

Again, Dr. C, and others with him, hold that the damned deserve no more than what is necessary to lead them to repentance. When they have endured sufficient to make them penitent they have receved their full desert. They also hold that the damned cannot be saved before they are penitent. These are maxims with all the Universalists, who hold that the wicked must suffer in hell, for a time, before they are saved; as we shall presently see. But, on this ground, it cannot possibly be otherwise than that the damned should suffer all they deserve to suffer. So much of the torments of hell as to make them penitent, is necessary and unavoidable. Dr. C. and the others grant and constantly urge this. Therefore, so much of the torments of hell as the damned deserve, is necessary, and unavoidable. They cannot be saved till they do repent: Such a degree of torment as to make them penitent they deserve, and no more: Such a degree of torment as to make them penitent is necessary: Therefore, all they deserve must necessarily be inflicted on them: Therefore, they must necessarily suffer all they deserve, before they can be saved. Which shows us the Doctor's plan of salvation.

Besides, on this plan, it is impossible the damned should be forgiven the least part of their ill deserts. They deserve such punishment, and no more, as to make them penitent. When, therefore, they repent they have nothing remaining for which they can be forgiven. When they have answered all the demands of justice, by their repentance, how is it possible any thing should be forgiven them? And if nothing can be forgiven them, then nothing but strict justice can take its course upon them. Accordingly, we may again take the Doctor's own words: 'Even the salvation of the damned, as it is posterior to their having undergone 'the torments of hell, is not the effect of gospel-forgiveness.'

Dr. C. uses a variety of such arguments and words, which express, as clearly as words can, the execution of strict justice on the damned. This, my Friend, you will at once see, by looking into Dr. C's book. Or you may find this matter accurately stated, in Dr. Edwards' *answer, I* and *II Sections*. Dr. Chauncy's words and arguments, being there collected and arranged, make it very plain, that he holds the damned suffer the utmost of their ill desert. And all the objections, the advocates for Dr. Chauncy can raise against this, with a view to deny that he holds to this sentiment, Dr. Edwards completely answers, as it is thought, by bringing in Dr. Chauncy's own words.

as

As a direct contradiction to this, Dr. Chauncy holds, *All men are ſaved by grace;* and that the damned are all finally ſaved by grace, and by the merits of Chriſt. Even the damned, after they have ſuffered the utmoſt demand of divine juſtice, are ſaved, Dr. C. ſays, not only by grace, but by *tender compaſſion and grace*, by *the infinite indulgence and love of their Creator*, and by *boundleſs and inexhauſtible goodneſs*; exerciſed only for Chriſt's ſake.*

To this Dr. Edwards replies: 'How can this part of Dr. C's 'ſyſtem be reconciled with that part, in which he holds, that all 'the damned will be puniſhed *according to their deſerts?* 'Can thoſe who are puniſhed *according to their deſerts*, after 'that be ſaved *on the foot of grace through Chriſt?* Can thoſe, 'who are puniſhed according to the nature and number of their 'evil deeds; in degree and continuance, in proportion to the 'number and greatneſs of their crimes; in whoſe puniſhment 'the divine law takes its courſe, and the threatened penalty is 'fully executed: can theſe perſons be ſaved by *a gift?* by a gift 'taken *in the abounding ſenſe? by the free gift of* GOD *through 'Chriſt? by rich mercy?* by *wonderful* deſign of *mercy?* by '*boundleſs* and *inexhauſtible goodneſs?* by the *utmoſt bowels of the divine compaſſion?* by the *infinite indulgence and 'love of their* CREATOR? Is the man who, by his crimes, has, 'according to law, expoſed himſelf to the pillory, or to be cropt 'and branded, and on whom the law has taken its courſe, and 'the threatened penalty has been fully executed; is he after all 'delivered from further ſuffering by *grace*, by *pity*, by *tender 'compaſſion*, by *indulgence and love*, by the *utmoſt bowels of 'compaſſion?*—No; he has a right on the foot of *mere law*, and 'of *the moſt rigorous juſtice* to ſubſequent impunity, with reſ-'pect to the crime or crimes, for which he has been puniſhed: 'and to tell him after he is thus puniſhed, that he is now releaſed 'by grace, by pity, by utmoſt compaſſion, by indulgence and love, 'would be the groſſeſt inſult.'†

'Again; how can thoſe, who have been puniſhed according 'to their deſerts, be ſaved *through* Chriſt, or *on his account?* 'How can the obedience or death of Chriſt be the *ground* or '*reaſon* of their ſalvation? Having ſuffered the full penalty 'threatened in the law, they have a right to demand future im-'punity, on account of their own ſufferings. What need then 'have they of Chriſt, of his obedience and death, or of his me-'diatory intervention, to be brought into the account? Dr. C. 'ſpeaks of *the deliverance* or *the redemption* which Chriſt has

'purchaſed

* P. 62, 75, 86, 326, 362, 405. † Edwards's *anſwer*, P. 9, 10.

' purchaſed *for all men.* But what need is there, that Chriſt ' ſhould purchaſe deliverance for thoſe who purchaſe it for them- ' ſelves, by their own perſonal ſufferings ?'*

Thus Dr. Chauncy not only involves himſelf in this fatal contradiction, but he reduces the grace of God, and the merits of Chriſt, to a mere ſound. He makes the damned ſuffer the full wages of their ſins, and puts them on a level with divine juſtice. He then goes on to tell, in the next breath, of the merits of Chriſt, of rich mercy, boundleſs goodneſs, infinite indulgence and love, diſplayed in their ſalvation. What is this but giving an empty ſound ? From the beginning, men have been diſpoſed to reduce the righteouſneſs of Chriſt to a mere name. They have invented works of ſepererogation, have urged that ſin carries its own penalty with it, and laſtly, that the damned ought, in juſtice, to come out of hell as ſoon as they repent. In this connection they can very freely ſpeak of the boundleſs grace of God, and infinite merits of Chriſt. That is, they can lay hold of the merits of Chriſt, and the grace of God, ſo as thereby to have a handle, to extol the perſonal merits of the creature. If men can pay the laſt mite they owe to divine juſtice, it is immaterial in what way they do it, whether by their own good works, their daily ſufferings, or the torments of hell. In either caſe it is creature-merit. And, in connection with creature-merit, to pretend to extol the grace of God, is only treating of it with contempt. ' On the ' whole, Dr. Chauncy's ſcheme comes to this : That not bare ' goodneſs, but that goodneſs, which is boundleſs and inexhauſt- ' ible ; not bare compaſſion, but the utmoſt bowels of the divine ' compaſſion, not bare indulgence and love, but the infinite in- ' dulgence and love of our Creator ; will grant to his creatures ' of mankind, juſt ſo much relief from miſery, as they are entitl- ' ed to, by the moſt rigorous juſtice.'*

All the Univerſaliſts who hold, that ſuch as die in their ſins muſt ſuffer for a time, in hell, before they can be ſaved, run into the ſame abſurdity. They cannot avoid it. That the damned ſhall ſuffer according to ſtrict juſtice, or according to their evil deeds, is ſo decididly taught in the bible, they cannot deny it. Again, they muſt either hold to ſalvation by grace only, or deny the goſpel. They, therefore, have no way left, but to deny that ſin deſerves endleſs puniſhment. So, on their plan, when the damned have undergone a limited puniſhment, and all they deſerve, then are they afterwards ſaved by grace. Hence, their ſcheme muſt needs deſtroy itſelf. Grace and debt, cannot exiſt together. Grace and debt, debt paid by the creature's ſuffering his full

T deſert,

* Ibid.

deſert, is abſurd.—Some other jarring contrarieties which go into their ſcheme, we ſhall remark. As,

2. Theſe writers profeſs, *ſacredly*, to take the threatenings and curſes of God's law in their literal meaning. 'Nor in any wiſe 'to weaken the force of the threatenings,'* Mr. Winchester ſays: Dr. Chauncy ſays the ſame, as we have ſeen; eſpecially in what he ſays of the threatening to the blaſphemer againſt the Holy Ghoſt. So all theſe writers join with the Doctor, in the ſame pertinent manner. But many things they advance, tend to reduce theſe threatenings to nothing; or rather to make them iſſue in *great and precious promiſes*. The following things may ſhow the truth of this remark.

Firſt. One neceſſary article with them, is, that the damned are delivered from hell and from ſuffering, as ſoon as they repent.—'The conſideration of *hell* as a *purging fire* is that *only* 'which can make the matter ſit eaſy upon one's mind.'† When, therefore, ſin is purged away, or when ſinners repent, there is no further need of this *purging fire*, but the damned muſt then be immediately freed from it.—'Sufferings, whether here or 'hereafter, are *only uſeful* to deſtroy the body of ſin; to burn 'up thoſe works of the fleſh, to ſtrip the ſinner of all his ſuppoſed goodneſs, to humble and ſubdue his rebellious diſpoſition.'‡ —'Divine juſtice is *always* ſatisfied when it attains its end; 'and this end is always attained, whenever the ſinner is brought 'to repentance.'§ Theſe expreſſions ſhow us one main article in their ſyſtem. Therefore, whatever theſe authors may ſay of the duration of hell torments, as being for many thouſands of years, for ages of ages, yet, on their plan, when the damned repent, their torments muſt then ceaſe. The 'end of divine juſtice is *always* attained, whenever the ſinner repents;' and 'ſufferings here or hereafter,' or the torments of hell 'are *only* '*uſeful*' to this end, to make the ſinner repent. This leaves the matter wholly at the choice of the damned; either to repent and eſcape miſery, the next moment, or to continue in it longer. But the dread of the torments of hell, allowing theſe torments to be ever ſo great, this moment, vaniſhes to nothing, provided the damned can be delivered from them and made happy, the next moment. And when it lies wholly with the choice of the creature to eſcape miſery and be happy, this can carry nothing terrifying with it. If he is delivered from miſery and made happy, he

* P. 184. † Dr. C's *Salv. all men.* ‡ Mr. Winchester's *Dialogues*, p. 163.
§ Mr. Peirpierre's *Thoughts on the Divine Goodneſs*. p. 126. And ſee Mr. Hartley's *Obſervations on Man*, Vol. ii. p. 429; alſo *Calviniſm and Univerſaliſm contraſted*, by Joſeph Young, p. 8, 40, 43.

he has his choice; if he is not delivered, he has his choice. And where is the evil or terror of giving a man his choice?

It is granted, when two evils are presented, and a man must unavoidably choose one of them; either of them, in this case, is terrible; that is, terrible according to its magnitude. But when only one evil is presented, and the man, on the most reasonable terms, has the offer to escape this evil; the offer of escaping, in this case, takes away all the terror; be the evil otherwise more or less. So when sinners are threatened to be sent to hell, with this promise, they shall certainly come out of hell as soon as they repent; this promise strips hell of its terrors.

Secondly. These writers tell of sinful men, of mere creatures, suffering to such a degree, in time, as to satisfy divine justice. And Mr. Winchester tells of finite beings suffering an infinite evil, in time, or perhaps in a few days. Who can believe such an absurdity? It is granted, where sin reigns, the feelings of the heart are a combination of contradictions. Sinners, of course, may be disposed to magnify their sufferings to an infinite degree; and so far effect it, in their imagination, as to set off even with their Maker, and often bring him into their debt. If, however, in one view, and to answer the above end, they may, and must to believe Mr. W, magnify their sufferings; they may also lessen them in another view; so fortify themselves against sufferings yet to come. But when they have, in their own false views, magnified every slight pain to an infinite degree, they must then suppose they have seen the worst of it; have already endured the *infinite evil;* can endure no greater, and have no greater to fear. Hence, on their plan, all the awful denunciations to impenitent sinners, in the law of God, of *vengeance*, of *destruction*, of *death*, of *the second death*, and of *judgment without mercy*, come to this; nothing more than what they have already seen and endured!

Thirdly. Those sinners who suffer to an infinite degree in this world; as long as they continue in hell, they increase their two-fold demand on divine justice. A doctrine most pleasing, instead of being terrifying to the carnal heart: especially as the damned can escape from hell whenever they choose to repent.

Fourthly. Mr. Hartley, Bishop Newton, Dr. Chauncy, and all other Universalists of this class, hold the torments of hell to be '*a purifying fire;*'* 'mercifully intended for the good of 'the patients or the damned themselves.'† These torments, they say, are an evidence that 'the character of God, as the *Father*

'*of*

* Mr. Hartley's *Observations on Man*, Vol. ii. p. 429. † Dr. C's *Salvation of all Men*, p. 324, 325.

'*of mercies*, and God of *pity and grace*, is not limited to this 'world only,'* but is wonderfully diſplayed in hell. And 'that 'the infinitely benevolent Deity is the ſame good being in the '*other* world, that he is in this;' or that he gives the ſame kind of tokens of mercy and pity in hell, as he does on earth. And that the miſery of the damned, and the benefit ariſing to them from their miſery, 'make it evident that God is a being of bound-'leſs and inexhauſtible goodneſs.'†—'Puniſhment,' ſay they, 'without having the reformation of rebels for its end, is unwor-'thy of the Being we adore.' 'Severe ſufferings make them '(the damned) eſteem ſalvation infinitely more than otherwiſe 'they would, and ſerve to bring their wandering ſouls to God.'‡ Thus, in their language, the miſery of the damned is a moſt wholſome diſcipline, ſuited in the beſt manner for their good, and for their greateſt good. Theſe writers alſo ſay, that it is be-cauſe God has tried every other mean firſt, that he ſends impen-itent ſinners to hell. 'The firſt rule that divine juſtice obſerves, 'is never to proceed to extreme rigour, till every gentle mean 'has been exhauſted without effect.' 'When every other me-'thod has failed of ſucceſs, ſeverity (in hell) muſt be employed, 'and will be made uſe of by God to ſubdue ſin, and bring about 'the ſanctification and ſalvation of the ſinner.'§ Therefore, as is often urged by theſe gentlemen, God never would ſentence one ſinner to hell, if he could by *gentle means* ſubdue them all, in this world; and he would, in this world, ſubdue and lead to repentance every ſinner of the human race, if he could 'conſiſt-'ent with the moral agency of creatures.'‖

Now, in this caſe, are the torments of hell terrifying? Are they really an evil? Are they truly a curſe? Are they indeed the curſe of God's law? No. They are a *purifying fire*; mercifully intended for the good of the *patients themſelves*; an evidence that God is, to the damned, *the Father of mercies*; an evidence of the infinite benevolence of the Deity, in the ſame manner as his acts of mercy on earth; an evidence of his *bound-leſs and inexhauſtible goodneſs*; and never uſed till every other mean has been exhauſted; and when uſed it is without the leaſt hazard, it is with poſitive certainty of ſucceſs. Every medicine excepting one, ſuppoſe, has been applied in vain, to a ſick pa-tient; but this one which remains can be given without the leaſt hazard; yea, it can be given with certainty of ſucceſs; it is in-deed

* Ibid, P. 326. † Ibid. ‡ Winchester's *Dialogues*, P. 31, 163. § Petitpierre, P. 113, 118. ‖ *Benevolence of the Deity*, P. 219. And ſee *Salvation of all Men*, P. 344; alſo, Biſhop Newton's *works*, Vol. vi. P. 361; alſo, Winchester's *Dialogues* P. 175, 158.

deed beyond a doubt, that this only remaining medicine will effect a complete cure. Now, allowing the firſt opperation of this medicine to be attended with great pain to the patient, ſtill, is it on the whole terrifying? Is it to be viewed as ſome moſt horrible thing? Is it the greateſt evil in the world? Is it to be dreaded and avoided as the moſt deadly poiſon? Is it a curſe to mankind, or a curſe to thoſe to whom it is adminiſtered? And is the phyſician, who adminiſters it, the executioner of this curſe? Nay. Every body grants this ſingular medicine to be the moſt valuable thing in the world: the greateſt of all temporal bleſſings to mankind, eſpecially to ſuch as are ſo fortunate as to have it applied to them. This illuſtrates and ſhows how Dr. Chauncy and his diſciples have found out the way, ſo as to convert *the curſe* into *a bleſſing*. The pains of hell, in their ſcheme, are the beſt means, and moſt effectual and certain to humble the damned and fit them for heaven; and never uſed till every other mean has been exhauſted. Inſtead of being alarmed or terrified at the pains of hell, the wicked, in this ſcheme, muſt view theſe pains to be moſt deſirable. The only mean, when all others fail, which is certain to fit them for heaven; and no more pain is to be inflicted than what is neceſſary to this end: Inſtead of being terrifying, what can be more deſirable?

Fifthly. Sinners vainly think, oftentimes, that they ſhall repent, whenever the motives ſet before them are ſufficiently ſtrong, ſo as to effect this end; which, as yet, has not happened to them. Now, believing in this flattering ſcheme, when the torments of hell ſhall awake upon them, then will the motives be ſo ſtrong as to effect their repentance immediately. Thus may the deceitful heart dream, that ſo much of the torments of hell as is neceſſary to effect their repentance, when nothing elſe can, will be to them the greateſt good, inſtead of an evil. What then becomes of the terrors of hell?

'It will here be objected, that the ſore trials and corrections, which, believers endure in this life, cannot, in themſelves, be called good things or bleſſings; they muſt in themſelves, be called evils.' And theſe evils are often very ſurpriſing and terrifying to them. But, as theſe evils are kind corrections, tokens of God's fatherly pity to his own dear children, why may not the pains and tortures of the damned be conſidered in the ſame light?

Anſwer. There is ſomething, it is granted, terrifying to believers, when they are plunged into the furnace of affliction; as is often the caſe with them, in this ſtate of trial. But this terror takes hold of them when they looſe ſight of the promiſes; this

is

is generally if not always the caſe. Let a believer have an humble hope and confidence, that God is about to afflict him in tender mercy, and his terror vaniſhes at once. Or this terror vaniſhes according to the ſtrength of his hope and confidence in God. See Iſai. xliii. 2. 3. and many other places.—Although the believer has, generally, ſome ſenſe of divine power, mercy, and faithfulneſs, yet he cannot always, and with certainty, apply the promiſes particularly to himſelf. Whereas, Univerſaliſts ſpeak of the torments of hell with certainty, beyond a doubt, that they will fit every one of the damned for heaven. So, that every one, on this plan, is certain that all the pain he is to endure, is the only thing to bring about his greateſt good. Where is the terror, in this caſe? What is Nebuchadnezzar's furnace, allowing that the man, to be caſt into it, is certain of coming out alive? and certain that all the pain and torture he endures, while in this furnace, will be to his greateſt advantage? Suppoſe, to endure the tortures of this furnace for a few hours or even days, were the cauſe or way, for a man to live afterwards in this world forever, and in perfect health and full tide of proſperity; would this furnace be dreaded? Would this man be diſpoſed to avoid it? But let this be as it may, the torments of hell, in this flattering ſcheme, are never to be uſed till every other mean has failed, and the damned are certain of being delivered from all pain, the moment they repent, the matter being left wholly at their choice. Hence, no objection can lie; this ſoothing doctrine of Univerſaliſts certainly does ſtrip hell of all its terrors.

Beſides, the above objection ſuppoſes the ſufferings of the damned to be tokens of God's fatherly pity to them, and in the ſame ſenſe as his kind corrections to believers, in this world. Which is making no difference between the righteous and the wicked, and no difference between the curſe and the bleſſing. And this is an impoſition upon common ſenſe, as well as a direct denial of ſcripture. This leads to remark,

3. Theſe Univerſaliſts pretend to be the foremoſt in extolling the grace of God; but the fact is, they are the firſt to depreciate and reduce it to nothing; for they do in holding that the pains of hell are *neceſſary*, as well as effectual, to ſubdue and bring to repentance obſtinate ſinners. Mr. Winchester ſays, 'Puniſhment, 'to a certain degree, inflames and enrages, in a moſt amazing manner; but continued longer, and heavier, produces a contrary 'effect—ſoftens, humbles, and ſubdues.' 'Some men are ſo 'ſunk in ſin as not to be reformed, by any means in this life; 'yet that is no argument, that God is not able to ſubdue and

'bring

'bring down the proud and moſt rebellious, in another ſtate, by 'means that may be uſed effectually there, though they could 'not be uſed here.'* Dr. Chauncy holds to the ſame, we have ſeen, and may ſee again; ſo the reſt of theſe writers are in the ſame ſentiment, it being one eſſential thing with them. But what a contemptible idea does this give of the fulneſs of divine grace, and of the agency of the holy Spirit? Does not God offer to reaſon with the chief of ſinners? 'Though your ſins be as ſcarlet, 'they ſhall be as white as ſnow; though they be red like crimſon, 'they ſhall be as wool.'† Is not the holy Spirit able to break the moſt obdurate heart, & to take away the heart of ſtone? Are not all things *now* ready? Is it not *now* the accepted time? No; ſay Dr. Chauncy & Mr. Wincheſter. Some men muſt wait till they get into hell: Grace is not ſufficient to reach every caſe, & the holy Spirit cannot renew the hearts of ſome of the moſt obſtinate, while they are in this preſent ſtate. '*Some men are ſo ſunk in ſin* as not to be 'reformed, *by any means in this life.*'—A direct contradiction to the whole drift of what theſe gentlemen ſay, on the fulneſs of the *atonement*, the ſufficiency of divine grace, and the *effectual working* of the holy Spirit. And Mr. Wincheſter ſpends a number of pages, or a whole *Lecture*, in attempting to prove that God even ſubdued and ſanctified the heart of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon.‡

Again, what right have they to ſay, that 'puniſhment, to a cer-'tain degree, inflames and enrages; but continued longer, and 'heavier, produces a contrary effect?' Let them firſt ſhow what degree of puniſhment is beſt ſuited to the end. Let them proportionate the degrees of puniſhment, ſo as to ſuit the caſe of each individual. Let them ſelect one from all the men of the earth, and ſhow whether God, by his Spirit, cannot enlighten him, and ſanctify his heart, as well without puniſhment as with. Or let them ſhow whether the greateſt puniſhment, can make the leaſt alteration in his heart, without the convincing and renewing power of the holy Spirit. The fact appears to be this; that Univerſaliſts have invented a mere *ſcarecrow* of hell torments, as their laſt reſort, to rid themſelves of this moſt humiliating doctrine: 'God hath mercy, on whom he will have mercy, and whom he 'will, he hardeneth.§

Inſtead of a place of miſery, in the next world, they might as well have invented a place of happineſs, as beſt ſuited to give repentance, and fit ſinners for heaven. On ſuppoſition there is another ſtate of probation, or one after death, there is as much evidence to believe, from what we find in ſcripture, that this is a ſtate of high

* *Dialogues*, P. 157, 158. † Iſai. 1. 18. ‡ See in his I. Vol. *of Lectures.* § Rom. 9. 18.

high proſperity & happineſs, as there is to believe it is a ſtate of great miſery. Allowing what is ſaid about *the happy millennium*, and, in the end, there will be far more of mankind prepared and made meet ſubjects for heaven, under gentle means, than there will by ſore afflictions and judgments. Theſe gentlemen often object againſt preaching up *terror*, and urge that it is *the goodneſs* of God which *leadeth to repentance*. Then why not a ſtate of happineſs, inſtead of miſery, as a ſtate of probation yet to come? The truth is, God has abſolute power over the hearts of men; as the potter over his clay, to make one veſſel to honour, and another to diſhonour. So God has a vaſt variety in the courſe of his providence, that he might declare his own divine fulneſs—his hatred to iniquity, his love to righteouſneſs, and love to the happineſs of his creatures. And, as to what we may expect, in the next world, our only way is to keep cloſe to revelation. Here we find no intimation of a ſtate of trial, or probation, after death, but every thing to the contrary.

4. Theſe writers appear to make ſin itſelf merit heaven and happineſs. After all they ſay of the evil and ill deſert of ſin, they appear to make it more meritorious, in the final iſſue, than even the righteouſneſs of Chriſt. Sin, they allow at once, merits the damnation of hell. And this is certain, in their ſcheme, to humble and ſubdue the damned; and certain to carry them to heaven. Now, in this caſe, there is no ſuch thing as grace to the damned. It is wholly their own merit, on the rules of ſtrict juſtice, *the divine law taking its courſe upon them*. The wicked deſerve or merit, in their own perſons, by their own ſins, the damnation of hell. This is a *purging fire*, ſuited to fit them for heaven. This purging fire is certain to prepare all the damned for heaven, and carry them there. If, therefore, ſinners, by their ſins, merit the means, they merit the end. If they merit that which is infallible and certain to fit them for heaven, and put them into eternal poſſeſſion of heaven, they of courſe merit heaven itſelf. Here we have the real language of univerſaliſm. Again, ſuch as perſevere in ſin till they die, this ſcheme makes them merit that, by their ſin, which the death of Chriſt does not merit. They merit thoſe means which are effectual and certain to fit them for heaven; when all the means, purchaſed by the death of Chriſt, totally fail of this end.

Dr. Chauncy denies the infinite evil of ſin, or that ſin deſerves endleſs puniſhment. It would be unjuſt for God to puniſh a creature eternally, for the ſin he commits in time: 'A reflection,' he ſays, 'on the infinite juſtice as well as goodneſs of God.'* But he

* P. 310.

he makes ſin merit that which will infallibly bring about endleſs happineſs. Sin merits, he ſays 'That *purging fire*, that good 'and wholſome diſcipline, ſo much to the *profit*, or *advantage*, 'of the *ſufferers themſelves*.'* And the only ſure and neceſſary mean to effect their endleſs good or happineſs. The Doctor and his diſciples are not alone in this blaſphemous ſentiment. All the wicked of earth and hell join with them in it, whenever they ſpeak the language of their hearts.

It will here be objected, that the ſcheme which embraces endleſs puniſhment is embarraſſed in the ſame manner. It ſuppoſes that believers, by their ſins, merit their heavenly Father's frowns or corrections. Theſe corrections are the means of, and have a direct tendency to, their eternal good. Therefore, believers merit that, by their ſins, which is the mean of their eternal good, and has a direct tendency to it.

Anſwer. (1.) It is denied that ſin merits that which is the mean of doing good, or that which has the leaſt tendency to do good, to him who commits the ſin. Sin ever merits evil, nothing but evil, & nothing but what tends to do evil; that is, to the perſon guilty of ſin. Otherwiſe ſin is not ſin. (2.) The ſins of believers God forgives. And, as an act of grace, having regard to the merits of Chriſt, he makes their corrections or afflictions work for their eternal good. In this caſe, as an act of grace, out of reſpect to no other but the merits of Chriſt. God deals with ſuch as are united to Chriſt by faith, directly contrary to what they merit by their ſins. So that, whatever is made the mean, or the occaſion of good to believers, it is not made ſo on account of the merit of ſin.—We have here the wide difference between the two ſchemes. The ſcheme that embraces endleſs puniſhment ſuppoſes that it is all of grace, inſtead of debt. Or that God conſtantly treats believers, infinitely better than what they deſerve: That God is under no kind of obligation, from any merit of theirs, to make their temporal afflictions iſſue in their higheſt good. It is of the LORD's mercies that they are not conſumed—made eternally miſerable. But the ſcheme of *univerſal ſalvation* ſuppoſes that God is bound by juſtice, to try all gentle means before he ſends ſinners to hell. And bound by juſtice to ſuit the torments of hell for the beſt good of the damned. 'Puniſhment, without having the re-'formation of rebels for its end, is unworthy of the being we 'adore.'† God can juſtly do no other than, either by gentle means, or ſevere puniſhment, or ſome other way, bring all men to repentance, and make them forever happy. What is moſt abſurd and blaſphemous, this ſcheme ſuppoſes that all men merit this

* P. 324, 325. † Wincheſter's *Dialogues*, P. 31.

by their sins. Even the sins of sinful men bind the Almighty, by the rules of justice, to do all this good for them. Hence,

5. This scheme argues that sin is not a moral evil. Where divine justice has no demand, there is no injury done to divine justice. And where no injury is done to divine justice, there is no moral evil done. And if divine justice has not a right to take hold of, and inflict punishment upon the creature, whether this punishment does him good, or not; then this creature owes nothing to divine justice; then divine justice has no demand upon him. Or if God is obliged, in justice to suit all the punishment he inflicts on sinners to their good; so as to make their punishment, on the whole, a good, instead of an evil; then certainly they owe God nothing, but God justly owes them. Divine justice, in this case, stands indebted to sinners, instead of sinners being indebted to divine justice. Therefore, divine justice has no demand on sinners: therefore, sinners have done no injury to divine justice, by their sins: therefore, their sins are not of the nature of moral evil. And if God is bound, in justice, and as the last mean, to administer to sinners, for their sins, that *good* and *wholsome discipline*, that *purging fire*, to prepare them for, and actually take them to heaven; it is plain at first view that their sins are moral virtues, instead of moral evils. Their sins merit that certain, infallible mean which puts them into possession of endless good. On this ground, or allowing this to be true, sin must be a moral virtue, instead of a moral evil.

Dr. Chauncy and the others with him cannot make out their scheme, only by arguing that sin carries with it no ill desert: or that sin merits good in lieu of evil. Let it be granted that sin is an evil, that sinners deserve evil, and nothing but evil, and their scheme must be given up at once. For, in this case, if God deals with the damned according to their desert, as scripture assures us he does, and as the Doctor himself grants; then the punishment God inflicts upon the damned, instead of reforming them and raising them up to happiness, only sinks them lower in misery.

6. We will see one more of Dr. Chauncy's inconsistencies. 'Such exertions of the Deity,' he says, 'as shall be *certainly* '*effectual* to restrain them (free agents) from perverting their 'faculties, look like a *moral impossibility*, or a method of conduct-'ing towards free agents, which is unfit, in the reason of things, 'as not being suited to the nature of such kind of beings.'* He considers it as '*inconsistent with the powers bestowed* on free 'agents, if, by any extrinsic power, their faculties are unavoida-'bly put into exercise *in one certain* way only.' He asks, 'If

'motives

* *Benev. of the Deity*, p. 219.

'motives in all caſes be ſet in ſuch a ſtrong and powerful light, 'as that no wrong choice could be made—how could ſuch a 'method of operation conſiſt with the proper powers of free 'agents? It does not appear to the human mind, a thing fit, that 'they (free agents) ſhould be thus irreſiſtibly guided by any *ex-* '*trinſic* power, though it were even divine.'*

The Doctor's object is to deny what is called *efficacious* or *irreſiſtible grace.* He argues that men cannot, conſiſtently with their liberty, 'be irreſiſtibly guided, *in one certain* way 'only, by any *extrinſic* power, or any power out of themſelves, 'though it were even divine.' And that God cannot 'ſet mo-'tives before men, in ſuch a powerful light,' and ſo afford the agency of his holy Spirit, as certainly to reſtrain them from perverting their faculties and make them true penitents, without deſtroying their free agency. Neither can God poſitively predetermine that men ſhall hereafter be holy, or turn from ſin to holineſs, without predetermining them to be mere machines. From the above quotations, this is evidently Dr. C's ſentiment. Yet he has written the whole of his book to make us believe, God has poſitively predetermined all men for heaven, and that the torments of hell will certainly and irreſiſtibly fit the damned for heaven.

To this inconſiſtency Dr. Edwards replies: 'Nor was it 'through inattention, that Doctor Chauncy held an extrinſic 'cauſe certainly operating on the minds of men. It is a doctrine 'eſſential and important in his ſcheme, that all the damned will 'be finally and certainly brought to repentance, and brought to 'repentance by the torments of hell too. Are not theſe tor-'ments a cauſe extrinſic to the human will? If that cauſe be 'certainly effectual to lead the damned to repentance, what, on 'the Doctor's plan, becomes of their moral agency? If that cauſe 'be not certainly effectual to lead them all to repentance; it is 'not certain that all men will be ſaved.—So that on the plan of 'the Doctor's book, either his grand doctrine of the final ſalva-'tion of all men, by a diſciplinary puniſhment, muſt be given 'up, or it muſt be ſuppoſed, that all, who are in that way ſaved, 'are diveſted of their moral agency and are reduced to mere ma-'chines.'†

'Upon Dr. C's plan of liberty, there not only is not, and 'cannot be, any certainty, that *all* men will be ſaved; but there 'is not, and cannot be, any certainty that *any one* man will be 'ſaved. The Divine Being himſelf cannot make it certain, 'without deſtroying moral agency. Not any of the promiſes of 'the

* *Ibid.* † P. 142.

'the goſpel give us aſſurance of the ſalvation of any man: nor 'is it in the power of God to give a promiſe of ſalvation which 'ſhall enſure the event, ſo long as men remain moral agents.'* For to make the event certain and fixed, as Dr. C. ſays, deſtroys moral agency; therefore, the event muſt be wholly uncertain, to be conſiſtent with the free agency of men.

'On the ſame hypotheſis concerning liberty, even though all 'men were delivered from hell and admitted to heaven, there 'would be no certainty that they would continue there. They 'would be conſtantly liable to ſin anew, and bring on themſelves 'a ſecond damnation. To deny this, would be, to allow that 'their faculties might conſiſtently with moral agency, be *cer-* '*tainly* and *fixedly* inclined to 'exerciſe themſelves in one way "only."†

Biſhop Newton, on whom Dr. Chauncy very much depends, is ſo honeſt as to acknowledge, If all men were delivered from hell and admitted to heaven, there would be no certainty of their continuing there. He again contradicts this, by aſſerting the final, eternal ſalvation of all men. The Biſhop ſays, 'This life 'is indeed a ſtate of trial, but not a trial to fix our fate forever, 'without any poſſibility of changing for better or for worſe, in 'the world to come. For if the righteous can be but righteous, 'and the wicked can be but wicked, and cannot act otherwiſe; 'there is an utter end of all freedom of will and morality of ac-'tion. Their virtue ceaſes to be virtue, and their ſin is no long-'er ſin.'——'The ſcripture aſſures us, that in the next life men 'will be made (Luke xx. 36) equal unto the angels; but 'angels, we know, have apoſtatized and fallen; and why may 'not men, even when made equal unto the angels?——If right-'eouſneſs ſhould degenerate and become wickedneſs; or if 'wickedneſs ſhould amend and become righteouſneſs; the ta-'bles would then be turned, and with the change of their nature, 'their ſtate and condition would be changed too."‡ The Biſhop is here conſiſtent, as to the uncertain ſtate, and liableneſs to change, in the next world. For, on his plan of liberty, could men be fixed in one certain ſtate, either of ſin or holineſs, there would then be 'an utter end of all freedom of will and morality 'of action,' as to them.

Now let us ſee the contradiction. 'It is *impoſſible*,' he ſays, 'for any creature to live in eternal torments—If nothing elſe, 'yet his own ſenſations and feelings *muſt* bring him one time or 'other to an acknowledgement of his ſin and of his duty.'—'The 'fire *muſt* in time purge away and conſume the droſs and leave 'only

* P. 244. † *Ibid.* ‡ *His works, quoted by Ed. againſt C.* p. 244, 245.

'only the gold behind. No creature *can be* ſo totally depraved 'and abandoned, as to hold out under the moſt exquiſite tor- 'tures, obſtinate and obdurate to all eternity.——In ſhort, if 'they have any ſenſe or feeling, any reaſon or underſtanding, 'any choice or free will, they *muſt* one time or other, ſooner or 'later, *be brought to repentance.*'—'Tortures upon tortures, 'tortures without end, no creature of the leaſt ſenſe of feeling '*can ſupport;* but *muſt* all be *brought to ſubmiſſion* at laſt: 'and they had much better make a virtue of *neceſſity.*'*——The Biſhop might as well ſay, Pages upon pages, volumes upon volumes, volumes without end, when made up of contradictions, can exhibit no light to the rational mind.

'And how ſhocking are the above contradictions?—'The fire 'muſt in time purge away and conſume the droſs and leave only 'the gold behind:' or hell torments muſt neceſſarily bring all the damned to repentance, and fix them in an eternal, unalterable ſtate of holineſs and happineſs. At the ſame time, when they ſhall arrive to heaven, and 'be made equal unto the angels, they 'may then apoſtatize'——'righteouſneſs may degenerate and 'become wickedneſs.' Again, 'If the righteous can be but 'righteous, and cannot act otherwiſe; there is an utter end of 'all freedom of will and morality of action. Their virtue (by 'becoming neceſſary virtue) ceaſes to be virtue.' At the ſame time, the damned, in hell, 'had much better make a virtue of '*neceſſity.*'

7. Joſeph Young, M. D, an univerſaliſt writer, ſpends a number of pages in reprobating the doctrine of the divine decrees, as held by Calviniſts; and would have us believe that this doctrine ſtrips ſinners of all blame, and of courſe puts an end to all virtue and vice. He then poſitively aſſerts the ſame doctrine. 'As the future ſalvation of mankind,' ſays he, 'de- 'pends entirely on the benevolence, wiſdom and power of God, 'they are in ſafe hands: his infinite benevolence inſpired him 'to create them; his infinite wiſdom laid the plan for their re- 'demption: and his infinite power muſt, and will accompliſh all 'that he has planned; although earth and hell ſhould ariſe in op- 'poſition againſt him.'† The powers of earth and hell, being thus controuled, muſt be entirely dependent on God. Therefore all things, as well as the 'future ſalvation of mankind,' are thus dependent. This argues that infinite wiſdom muſt foreknow, and infinite power and benevolence muſt predetermine, all things that come to paſs. This writer then eſtabliſhes the ſame doctrine, which he ſo zealouſly oppoſes.

Again,

* *Ibid*, p. 245. † *Young's Letters*, p. vii.

Again, he ſays, 'Calvin,' and all, who hold to endleſs puniſhiſhment, 'attribute to the Deity, acts of cruelty, that would 'ſcandalize and blacken the character of a Nero or an Herod!'* But he ſays himſelf, ſpeaking of the *ſpirits in priſon*, 1 Pet. iii. 19, 'Theſe poor miſerable beings had remained captives and 'cloſe priſoners in the pit, wherein is no water, near two thou-'ſand four hundred years, when the ſaviour entered the dreary 'manſions of miſery and woe, and preached to them the goſpel.'† Doubtleſs this writer will grant, this long ſtate 'of miſery and 'woe' to have been inflicted by the Deity himſelf. But did ever 'a Nero or an Herod, inflict a longer or more painful miſery on any of mankind? The truth of the caſe is, a Nero or an Herod puniſhed men from wanton pride or vain humour, without regarding the public good. Whereas God ever regards the public good. From this motive, and when men deſerve it, whether God puniſhes them 2400 years, or to eternity, it is ſo far from being cruelty in him, that it is perfect benevolence. But this writer will not grant his 2400 years of miſery and woe, to have been deſigned eſpecially for the public good, and that the public good required it. This would be giving up his whole ſcheme, and acknowledging *vindictive* puniſhment. Of courſe, that God, to vindicate his honour and the general good, may puniſh the damned without end, as well as 2400 years. Neither can he plead that theſe miſerable priſoners are better fitted for heaven, or have a greater reward, than thoſe who go directly from this world to heaven. All Univerſaliſts, in the ſcheme of ſome future puniſhment, hold that the *faithful*, who go directly to heaven, have a greater reward than ſuch as are firſt ſent to hell. And ſhall we queſtion the fullneſs of Chriſt, or that his grace is not ſufficient to make *one* faithful, in this world, as well as *another*?

Theſe 2400 years, therefore, 'of miſery and woe,' are totally loſt. It anſwers no valuable end to thoſe who ſuffer it. Or, through the boundleſs mercy of Chriſt, they might have been fitted, even better fitted for heaven, in this world; alſo wholly eſcaped this miſery. Neither does it ſerve as a mean to vindicate the glory of God, and advance the general good. Therefore, as this writer argues, to anſwer no valuable purpoſe, or, in this needleſs manner, God confines, cloſely confines theſe miſerable captives, in theſe dreary manſions of woe; and for this long period of time. The queſtion now is, whether the writer himſelf does not 'attribute to the Deity that which would ſcandalize and blacken 'the character of a Nero or an Herod!'

Perhaps

* P. viii. † P. 84, 85.

Perhaps Joseph Young, M. D. will grant that God foreordained these 2400 years of misery and woe. Otherwise how could it take place, i. e. if God did not foreordain it? Or should he deny divine foreordination, as to this event, it would be equally against his scheme. For then he must grant that satan, in this instance, gets the better of Christ. Or should he grant that God certainly foreknew this event, it would be equally against him; or should he deny that God certainly foreknew it, it would be equally against him.* But when Christ comes to preach the gospel to these miserable captives, he *must* grant, for them to be delivered from these dreary mansions, 'their faculties must unavoidably be put 'into exercise *in one certain* way only; they had much better 'then make a virtue of *necessity*.' Which necessity puts an end to all virtue and vice.

8. Universalists make use of this text, 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19. 'Christ also hath once suffered for sins,—being put to death in 'the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit. By which also he went 'and preached to the spirits in prison.' From this they conclude that Christ, immediately after his crucifixion, went among the damned, and there preached to them the way of salvation; so to bring them to repentance and take them out of their prison. But this conclusion or opinion cannot stand. For, (1.) It is a contradiction to Christ's words, John iii. 4. 'I must work the 'works of him that sent me; while it is day, the night com-'eth, when no man can work.' Implying that all his works of preaching to sinners, and doing miracles upon them, must be done before his death. Or when *the night*, or death should come to him, he could no more work these works; that is, immediately, or in his own person, or as God manifest in the flesh. So, after death, *no man can work* any work which shall turn to his salvation. The same as in Eccl. ix. 10. 'Whatsoever thy hand 'findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor 'device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave whither we 'are going.' It is in vain, therefore, to talk of the repentance of the damned. (2.) If the damned repent when Christ goes among them, why are they previously tormented, and to their full deserts? And how are the torments of hell the last and only mean to make them penitent? This is left for Dr. Chauncy or his disciples to answer. But, (3.) If the damned repent at the preaching of Christ, before the day of judgment, how will they then be judged and rewarded according to their deeds, done in the body? (4.) Universalists have overlooked the plain sense of the

* In p. 15. he speaks against *foreknowledge* in the the same sense as he does against *foreordination*; and holds to infinite wisdom.

the above words: 'Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: By which he went and preached,' &c. That is, *by which Spirit* he went and preached to the spirits in prison. The only question then is, when Christ, by the holy Spirit, preached to these prisoners? And the answer is given in the same connection; verse 20. 'When once the longsuffering 'of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing.' The sinners of the old world, therefore, who, once despised their day of grace, and the preaching of righteousness by Noah, are now in the prison of hell; reserved for the judgment of the great day, then to be rewarded according to their evil deeds. A most solemn warning to Universalists, instead of giving the least colour to their false scheme.

I am, &c.

END OF PART II.

Univerſaliſm confounds and deſtroys itſelf, &c.

PART III.

The natural and proper meaning of everlaſting, eternal, forever, forever and ever, and the original words from which theſe are tranſlated, ſhown to be endleſs duration. Alſo, objections conſidered.

LETTER I.

Shewing the common uſe of theſe words, and their neceſſary uſe and import in Scripture.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

EVERY one muſt grant the importance of underſtanding the true meaning of theſe words. Hence, the following things.

I. Everlaſting, eternal, forever, forevermore, forever and ever, are ſynonimous terms; having one meaning; and all derived from the word *eternity*. Likewiſe, in the original Greek, there are ſeveral derivatives from the *root* or *noun*, which, into our language, is tranſlated *eternity*. This will hereafter require particular attention.

II. Theſe words, as well as all others that give an unlimited idea, are often uſed in the limited ſenſe, by way of figure or metaphor. Of an earthly monarch, of a mere man, we ſay, His horſes and troops are innumerable, his ſtrength or power is infinite. So of ancient No,——— 'Ethiopia and Egypt were her 'ſtrength, and it was infinite.' Nah. iii. 9. So we ſay, The eternal hills, the everlaſting mountains. Theſe are bold ſtriking figures, to ſet forth the ſtrength of ſuch a monarch, compared to other earthly powers; and the duration of the hills and mountains, compared to other things. But this figurative uſe of *infinite* and *eternal* does not alter their literal meaning, when they are uſed in their proper and literal ſenſe. If it did, there would be an end to the meaning of all words.

III. When words are figuratively uſed, the figure muſt be well underſtood, or it muſt come within the reach of our ſenſes. Thus

the hills and mountains are objects of ſight, and we ſee them every year waſhing down into the vallies. And we know from ſcripture they will come to an end. So the ſtrength of No, we are aſſured was not ſtrictly infinite. As theſe things come within the reach of our ſenſes, being well underſtood, there is no room for miſtake. We at once ſee the figurative uſe of theſe unlimited terms, when applied to them. But, when talking about things of the inviſible and eternal world, words muſt then be uſed in their literal ſenſe. We know nothing of inviſible things, only as we are informed by words, or by Revelation. Which obliges us, in this caſe, to take the ſenſe of words, not by a figure or metaphor, but in their natural, proper meaning. That is, if an inviſible object or being is called infinite, boundleſs, or eternal, we are obliged to take theſe words, ſo deſcribing his attributes, in their literal ſenſe, according to their natural import. The reaſon for this is plain, we have no way to learn the attributes of inviſible objects, only as they are revealed. Suppoſe, for inſtance, angels or devils were in ſcripture called infinite, in power or wiſdom; we ſhould be compelled to conſider them as ſuch, unleſs we had ſpecial information to the contrary. And, for objects of the inviſible world to be called, in one place of ſcripture, infinite, boundleſs, and eternal; in another, finite, limited, and temporal; this would make nothing but confuſion. The reaſon is, becauſe theſe objects lie wholly out of our ſight, and we cannot learn their nature and qualities except by words of ſcripture. In this inſtance, therefore, we ſhould not know when to take the words ſtrictly, or when by way of metaphor. Whereas, mountains, hills, armies, nations, monarchs, and other things of this world, being objects well known without revelation, unlimited terms may be applied to them, without any danger of miſtake: the figurative uſe of theſe terms, ſo applied, being plain at firſt view.

IV. It appears that theſe words, everlaſting, eternal, &c. may be, and often are in ſcripture, uſed in a two fold ſenſe, both temporal and eternal. They are applied to ſhadows or types; which ſhadows or types, in themſelves conſidered, fade away or come to an end. But theſe fading things, theſe ſhadows that periſh, contain, wrapt up in them, things that do not fade away, things that abide forever. Theſe ſhadows or types contain, or they promiſe bleſſings ſtrictly endleſs or eternal. So the land of Canaan was given to Abraham as a type and promiſe of heaven; and given to him by an everlaſting covenant. The *ſubſtance* promiſed to Abraham in this grant of Canaan, which was heaven, was ſtrictly everlaſting. While the *ſhadow* or earthly inheritance was temporal.

temporal The word *everlaſting*, therefore, being applied both to the ſhadow and ſubſtance, has its twofold meaning, temporal and eternal. Or it is applied to a compound object, or a twofold object, which is both temporal and eternal. Further attention will be paid to this, in another place.

V. It appears evident from facts, that the word *eternity* and its derivatives, in common language, have had one fixed, and natural, and proper meaning. And, when uſed in their direct or natural ſenſe, they have been uſed to expreſs *endleſs duration.* Here an appeal may be made both to the learned and unlearned for the truth of this. And whether all *profane* writers, as they are called, among all nations, have not uſed theſe words to intend endleſs duration. And have applied them, when in their direct and proper uſe, to mean nothing elſe.

When men, as in our or ſome other dialect, ſay, though blaſphemouſly, they wiſh ſuch a man to be *eternally miſerable, damned to eternity!* the ſenſe is fixed, and plain to every one. We do not want ſome one to come and explain ſuch kind of expreſſions; or to prove that they mean unceaſing torment. They can be interpreted in no other ſenſe. For one to attempt a new interpretation of the word *eternity*, as it is uſed in common ſpeech, or to prove that it does not mean ſtrictly *endleſs*, would be the height of folly. For one to attempt a new interpretation of *everlaſting* or *forever*, as men uſe them in common, and join them to things of the next world, would be labour in vain. The ſenſe of them, in this caſe, is already fixed, and cannot be altered.

When theſe words are uſed out of their natural courſe, or about our temporal matters, the ſenſe is fixed and plain, without hazard of ambiguity or deception. For inſtance, conveyance of lands is made; the *deed* running, 'To him and his heirs *forever*.' Here the main object and force of the term, *forever*, is plain. Not to warrant that the lands ſhall continue in being without end. Nor to warrant to the poſſeſſor, or his heirs, their continuance in being without end. The warranty has nothing to do with this. But, on his part, his buſineſs is to give conveyance; binding himſelf and heirs to defend againſt all legal claims, which may hereafter ariſe, without any limitation, and as we may properly ſay, *forever without end. Forever*, therefore, in this caſe, is uſed, in one certain view, in the unlimited ſenſe. And no other word, excepting parallel ones, could anſwer the ſame purpoſe.* So when a ſervant binds himſelf to his maſter, *forever;*

* Dr. Chauncy, as we ſhall yet ſee, holds that *forever* means ſimple duration, whether *longer* or *ſhorter*. Now, let his advocates try the matter, and put the ſame thing in practice. Let ſome one of them receive a conveyance or deed of lands, running 'To him and his heirs *forever*;' that is, in his own language, whether *longer* or *ſhorter*.

ever; he does not engage the continuance of his own life; but he promiſes never to break away from his maſter—never to renounce his ſervice—never to deſpiſe or hate him. This promiſe in one view is unlimited. Excepting figurative expreſſions, as the everlaſting mountains, the eternal hills, &c. which will again be explained; it appears that theſe words, in common ſpeech, even about temporal things, generally if not always convey ſome one unlimited idea.

But, when joined with things of a future world, they ſtrike the mind with the moſt forcible, determinate, and awful idea. Eternity! how ſerious, how awful! Ages of ages, ages of ages, added, and multiplied, bear no proportion to it. Thus the fixed and determinate ſenſe of *eternity* and its derivations, in common language, and among all nations.

VI. The general uſe of them in common converſation, and among all profane writers, muſt determine their uſe and import in the ſcriptures. It muſt do ſo, unleſs ſpecial caution be given in the ſcriptures to the contrary. The bible is not deſigned to impoſe upon men's underſtandings; it is addreſſed to their conſciences; it is accordingly written in words they readily underſtand. As to the eſſential things contained in it, the bible is the moſt intelligible of all books. This is allowed by all who hold to the bible. The ſubject of eternity, alſo, is moſt intereſting. Which makes it evident, if the word *eternity* and its derivatives mean ſomething different, in the ſacred volume, from what we find in other books, there muſt be a particular caution and warning, given, as to this matter. But where do we find Moſes or the prophets, Chriſt or the apoſtles giving this caution? Where do we find them explaining away *eternity?* Where do we find them giving a formal and new explanation of *everlaſting?* Or telling the world, or giving the leaſt hint, that they meant ſomething different by it from its common acceptation? The pagan world has all along had rude notions as to the place of departed ſpirits; but as to eternity, ſimply conſidered, there has been but one idea, and among the whole race of Adam. And but one interpretation to theſe words, if we except the ſentiment we are now oppoſing.

Had the world miſtook the ſenſe of theſe words, eſpecially Chriſt and his apoſtles would have rectified this miſtake. And had Chriſt intended a new meaning to them, or ſomething different from their common received meaning through the world, he certainly would have told us of it. As to this the firſt of all ſubjects, Chriſt and his apoſtles would have told us over and

over

over again. But as they have given no intimation of this kind, we muſt conclude that they intended the ſame thing by everlaſting, eternal, &c. as was then commonly underſtood. Which, when they are joined with things of the coming world, is *endleſs duration*. It is indeed a groſs imputation upon Chriſt's character, to ſuppoſe that he intended one thing by theſe words and his hearers another. And that he left them to go away under this miſtake, even a miſtake about the ſenſe of ETERNITY. Thus the interpretation the world of mankind have put upon theſe words, compells us to ſee their natural meaning in the holy ſcriptures; eſpecially when they are applied to things of the future life.

VII. How the Jews underſtood theſe words, in the days of Chriſt, helps to decide their true import, in the ſacred volume.

Joſephus, who wrote in the latter part of the apoſtolic age, it is allowed by all, wrote the ſentiments of his nation, at that time, and for ſeveral preceding ages; and uſed words according to the ſenſe of his nation, at that time, and from the days of Moſes. From which we are able to collect the ſentiments of the Jews, and the interpretation they put upon words, at the time of Chriſt's public miniſtry. And, as Joſephus was writing for the benefit of the Greeks and Romans, as well as his own nation, he alſo muſt have uſed words according to their underſtanding.—*Concerning Hades*, where he treats of the *final judgment*, he ſays, 'This perſon (God the Word) exerciſing the righteous judgment 'of the Father towards all men, hath prepared a juſt ſentence for 'every one, according to his works; at whoſe judgment ſeat, 'when all men, and angels, and demons ſhall ſtand, they will ſend 'forth one voice, and ſay, JUST IS THY JUDGMENT: the re-'joinder to which will bring a juſt ſentence upon both parties, by 'giving juſtly to thoſe that have done well, an *everlaſting fruition;* but allotting to the lovers of wicked works *eternal puniſhment*. To theſe belong the *unquenchable fire*, and that with-'out end, and a certain fiery *worm never dying;* and not de-'ſtroying the body, but continuing its eruptions out of the body 'with neverceaſing grief.'

Thus the endleſs happineſs of the righteous, Joſephus calls 'everlaſting fruition,' and the endleſs miſery of the wicked, 'eter-'nal puniſhment.' He evidently has no deſign of explaining *everlaſting* or *eternal*. And through the whole of his *works*, nearly two thouſand pages, he uſes theſe terms as though every one underſtood them, and their import had not been called in queſtion. He gives no intimation that they had ever been taken in a

limited

limited sense, when applied to the things of the coming world. In the above statement, his object is to explain what he intends by the *punishment* joined with the word *eternal*. Which is *unquenchable fire*, and that *without end*; a fiery worm *never dying*, which does not destroy the body, but causes *never-ceasing grief*. This places the matter beyond dispute; as to what he means by *eternal*. But this explanation of the *punishment* joined with eternal, is not, designedly, or as an object, to explain *eternal* itself. Did he here intend to explain his sense of *eternal*, as though it needed explanation, he must, according to his usual accuracy, have taken the term by itself. Instead of this he uses it promiscuously with *unquenchable*, *without end*, *never dying*, *and never-ceasing*. Hence, it is clear, Josephus considers the proper and natural sense of *eternal* and *everlasting* to be *endless*. This is further confirmed by his use of these terms in other places. He sometimes joins them with the future misery of the wicked, and happiness of the righteous, without any other word to show his meaning, or without any synonimous word: considering these alone to be sufficient, importing as much as a thousand others could. He also speaks of '*temporary punishments*' in opposition to '*everlasting punishments*.'* Which he could not do, if by *everlasting* he meant *for ages of ages only*. In this case there would be no opposition; ages of ages is a temporary duration.

But the sense in which Josephus uses them, shows how the Jews used them and understood them, at the time of Christ's public ministry; which was, in their natural course, to mean endless duration. But it is unaccountable to suppose that Christ should, so solemnly, adjudge obstinate sinners to *eternal damnation*, *everlasting fire*, and *everlasting punishment*; and by this mean a limited punishment, when the Jews understood these expressions to mean endless punishment. At the same time, that Christ, in no instance, should correct their mistake. To say, Christ preached the salvation of all men, does not relieve the difficulty. He did not preach it to the understanding of the Jews. He therefore left them to mistake some of the most important words, then in use.

Universalists grant, that the Jews held the doctrine of endless punishment. And it is evident they held this, from the curse they pronounced upon the Samaritans, for their idolatrous worship on mount Gerizzim, in imitation of the true worship.† This also is evident from their general conduct towards the Samaritans, as related in the scriptures. This doctrine of endless punishment,

* On Hades, Sec. 1, 2. † *See Prideaux's Connection*, p. 414, 415. Vol. i.

iſhment, in the view of Univerſaliſts, was then one capital error among the Jews. But why did not Chriſt reprove them for it? and whether they would hear, or whether they would forbear? And if Chriſt, in any way, or in any ſenſe, taught univerſal ſalvation, why did not the Jews find it out? Why did they not bring an accuſation againſt him, on this account, before the high prieſt? alledging that he ſpoke againſt Moſes and the prophets? However wide the diſagreement was between Chriſt and the Jews, it is plain from the nature of the caſe, there was no diſagreement between them on account of the doctrine of endleſs puniſhment. Nor any diſagreement between them as to the ſenſe of the words under conſideration.

As Chriſt and the Jews, the body of them, agreed, as to the reſurrection of the dead, the day of judgment, future rewards and puniſhments; ſo they agreed, as it plainly appears, as to the duration of theſe rewards and puniſhments, and the words uſed to fix their duration. It is remarkable, in deſcribing the day of judgment, and the ſentence to be pronounced on the righteous and the wicked, Chriſt makes uſe of the ſame words as Joſephus does; which words were commonly uſed among the Jews. But can we ſuppoſe that Chriſt, by the 'everlaſting fire,'* meant fire to torment the wicked only for ages of ages, when he knew the Jews would take it in the endleſs ſenſe? Can we ſuppoſe Chriſt meant one thing by *everlaſting*, when he knew the Jews would take it to mean another, and quite the oppoſite? Can we ſuppoſe Chriſt thus left the whole body of the Jews in ignorance, as to the affairs of the final judgment?

To ſay Joſephus, as he wrote forty or fifty years after Chriſt, learned theſe expreſſions of chriſtians, does not free us from difficulty. It does not appear that he had much connection, if any, with chriſtians. But granting he had; and granting that Chriſt uſed *everlaſting* and *eternal*, as Univerſaliſts pretend he did; then both Jews and Chriſtians muſt have underſtood him in this ſenſe. Of courſe, Joſephus, if connected with chriſtians, muſt have underſtood the two oppoſite ſchemes and the two oppoſite interpretations of theſe words. Therefore, he would not have deſcribed the day of judgment by the uſe of theſe words, without ſome more explanation of them, than what he has given. Neither would he have ſpoken ſo favourably of Chriſt and his diſciples, as he has now done. A denial of the endleſs puniſhment of the damned, muſt have been one inſuperable objection, in the mind of Joſephus, againſt Chriſt and his followers.

VIII. It

* Matt. 25. 41.

VIII. It was *neceſſary* there ſhould have been words, or certainly ſome one word, in the bible, which in its natural import means endleſs duration. Otherwiſe the language would have been eſſentially deficient, and the bible would have wholly failed of anſwering the end it now does. The grand object of the ſacred volume is to treat of endleſs things, things ſtrictly eternal. The reaſon why we needed a ſpecial revelation, was, that we might be informed as to things *unſeen and eternal.* Things moſt intereſting to us, as we are to exiſt in the *unſeen* ſtate, without end. We might therefore expect to find this ſubject, in the ſacred pages, accurately ſtated; and by words, or ſome one word, which could not be reaſonably diſputed. And this is the caſe with the words now before us. There is no reaſonable ground to queſtion or diſpute their meaning. Their meaning never would have been called in queſtion, had it not been to ſupport a falſe ſcheme. It is alſo *neceſſary* to take their direct and natural meaning to be endleſs duration, elſe the bible becomes of no uſe. For,

1. If God is not herein plainly and directly revealed, to be the eternal God, then there is nothing revealed which decides his character, as God. Or if we raſe out, or queſtion, or deny what is ſaid of his eternal duration, we may as well do the ſame as to the whole of his character, and as to the whole of revelation.

To prove the attributes of Deity, from the things that are made, we commonly begin with his eternal exiſtency. This ſeems to be the natural, if not neceſſary and only mode of proof. If he is truly eternal, or without beginning and end, then he is underived; then he is ſelfexiſtent and independent; then he is allſufficient, having all poſſible power and wiſdom. But unleſs he is allowed to have underived or uncreated exiſtence, it cannot be decided beyond diſpute that he has all poſſible power and wiſdom. Again, unleſs he is allowed to have eternal exiſtence, without beginning and without end, it cannot be fully decided that he is an uncreated Being. So, if he is, in ſcripture, called the Almighty, and infinite in underſtanding, but nothing ſaid of the eternity of his being; it might at leaſt be queſtioned whether his power and wiſdom were underived and uncreated. But when it is revealed that he is ſtrictly eternal, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, all his other attributes are proved of courſe. It is then beyond diſpute that he is uncreated, ſelfexiſtent, allpowerful, and all-wiſe. In this light it is ſtated by the apoſtle. Rom. i. 20. 'The inviſible things of him from the creation of 'the world are clearly ſeen, being underſtood by the things

'that

'that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead.' Eternal power, in the moſt convincing and awful manner, ſtrikes the mind with a ſenſe of boundleſs power; and as being neceſſarily ſuch. So eternal wiſdom is neceſſarily boundleſs, cannot be otherwiſe. But *almighty power*, or *the Almighty*, allowing nothing in ſcripture to be ſaid of his eternal exiſtency, might at leaſt give ground of ſuſpicion, that this was delegated power, and this almighty being one that has all rule and all authority, committed to him by the eternal or firſt Cauſe. For, if we leave out or deny what ſcripture ſays of one divine attribute, by the ſame rule we may do ſo reſpecting another. And each divine attribute, one as well as another, is neceſſary to his being or Godhead. It is, therefore, neceſſary it ſhould be ſo revealed, that eternal exiſtency is joined, or is one with almighty power, and infinite wiſdom to determine theſe attributes to be ſtrictly unlimited. But how can he be plainly and directly revealed as 'the eternal God,'* unleſs there are words, or ſome one word in ſcripture which expreſſes the eternity of his being? And what can be more natural, than to conclude that ſcripture does reveal the eternity of his being, by words which are indiſputable?

To prove 'the *abſolute eternity* of God, it is of no ſignifi-'cancy,' Dr. Chauncy ſays, 'in point of argumentation, that '*this phraſe (everlaſting)* is ſometimes applied to him.'† 'Reaſon aſſures us,' he adds, 'that God is a being whoſe *dura-'tion* will have no end; and it is from this *previouſly known* 'nature of God, and not ſimply from the *force* of this phraſe '(everlaſting), that we interpret it, when applied to God, as 'meaning a *duration without end*.'‡ Reaſon aſſures us, it is granted, that there is one eternal being, the firſt cauſe of all things. But reaſon does not aſſure us that this eternal firſt cauſe is the being named in the bible, unleſs he is revealed as ſuch, in the bible. How does reaſon tell us who the God here named, is, unleſs his character is here revealed? Certainly reaſon tells us to reject this character, as being the eternal Supreme, unleſs he is ſo revealed. He here declares himſelf to be GOD. But this name is rendered moſt awful and glorious on account of his attributes. God has revealed his own attributes; and great part of the ſacred pages is taken up for this end. But if his *abſolute eternity* be not here revealed, one main attribute is wanting, ſo all the reſt of his attributes are wanting.

Furthermore, we may as well ſay, it is from 'the previouſly 'known nature of God,' that we argue him to be omnipotent, all-wiſe, &c. and not from the *force* of the words which expreſs

* Deut. 33. 27. † P. 303. *Salvation all Men.* ‡ Ibid.

theſe attributes. So, in the Doctor's line of *argumentation*, we may make great part of ſcripture of *no ſignificancy*; eſpecially that which is expreſſive of divine perfection. We ſhall ſee more of this in anſwering objections.

Reaſon therefore tells us, if God reveals himſelf to be that God who is 'clearly ſeen from the things that are made,' from the light of nature; then certainly he muſt and does reveal himſelf to be the eternal God. And revelation informs us, that God has indeed revealed his full or complete character, not by a courſe of argumentation only, as Dr. C. pretends, but in expreſs words; ſo plain as even a child may read and underſtand. The only queſtion now, is, what words of ſcripture are the moſt plain and decided, to eſtabliſh the *abſolute eternity* of God? And the words before us, *Eternity* itſelf, this word and the words derived from it are the moſt plain, and uſed, in ſcripture, tenfold more than all the reſt, for this purpoſe. They are not more decided than ſome others. For theſe, and ſome others, of ſacred writ, as decidedly fix the ſtrict eternity of JEHOVAH, as is poſſible for words to do. If *theſe* do not, neither do *others*. So ſcripture fails of giving us God's full character; and therefore becomes of no uſe. Theſe things will again come in queſtion.

2. It is neceſſary to conſider the direct and natural meaning of theſe words to be *endleſs duration*, ſo to determine that the kingdom and reign of Chriſt has no end.

Dr. Chauncy denies the endleſs reign of Chriſt. Right againſt ſcripture, he aſſerts that the *dominion* of Chriſt *ſhall paſs away*.* The Doctor holds that Chriſt will reign in his mediatorial character, after the day of judgment, till he has brought all the damned to repentance, or completely ſaved all mankind. And that he will then give up or renounce all government and authority over thoſe who ſhall be ſaved by him. To ſupport this ſentiment, the Doctor cites 1 Cor. xv. 24—28. His interpretation of this paſſage argues that Chriſt is not a divine perſon, but a mere creature. And when, in the *end*, *he ſhall deliver up the kingdom to God the Father*, he will then take the place of a mere creature. Of courſe, the Doctor, Mr. Winchester, and others with them, conſider the word *everlaſting*, when joined with the *dominion* of Chriſt, to be uſed in the limited ſenſe. This miſtake is at once detected, and the whole of their argument vaniſhes, by conſidering Chriſt a divine perſon. For then he is one with the Father, and reigns in and with the Father, without end.

Dr.

* See Dan. 7. 14.

Dr. Edwards ſays, 'It may be preſumed, that no man will 'ſay, that the Father does not reign now while the adminiſtration 'of univerſal government is in the hands of the Son. If he did 'not now reign, there would be no propriety in ſpeaking as the 'ſcripture often does, 'Of him that ſitteth on the throne, and 'the Lamb;' nor any propriety in the promiſe, John xv. 16; 'That whatſoever ye ſhall aſk of the *Father* in my name, he may 'give it you.'—'For the ſame reaſon therefore that the Father 'now reigns in and with the Son; ſo, after the reſignation of the 'general delegated adminiſtration, the Son will ſtill reign in and 'with the Father.—Although Chriſt ſhall immediately after the 'general judgment, reſign the ſupreme delegated ſovereignty, 'which he now poſſeſſes; ſtill he will reign in theſe two reſ-'pects, by a delegated ſubordinate authority over his ſaints; and 'by an undelegated, eſſential authority, which, by virtue of his 'divinity, he poſſeſſes neceſſarily with the Father.'*

Whether the true idea of Chriſt's *delivering up the kingdom* to the Father, is accurately given by Dr. Edwards, or not; ſtill revelation aſſures us, that in ſome ſenſe Chriſt will reign to an abſolute eternity. Heb. i. 8. 'Unto the Son, he ſaith, Thy 'throne, O God, is forever and ever.' Rev. xxii. 5. 'They '(the redeemed) ſhall reign forever and ever.' 1 Pet. v. 4. 'When the chief ſhepherd ſhall appear, ye ſhall receive a crown 'of glory that fadeth not away.' 1 Cor. ix. 25. 'We do it to 'obtain an incorruptible crown.' The redeemed are to ſit down with Chriſt on his throne, and reign with him. 'And it is ab-'ſurd to imagine,' Dr. Edwards ſays, 'that *they* are to reign af-'ter the ceſſation of his reign; that they are to wear crowns 'which are incorruptible and fade not away; but that his crown 'is corruptible and fadeth away.'† Theſe things make it evident, that thoſe mentioned in Rev. xx. 6, who have part in the firſt reſurrection, who ſhall be prieſts of God and of Chriſt, and ſhall reign with him a thouſand years; ſhall alſo, in this character, reign with him forever and ever. But how can they thus reign, unleſs Chriſt their head and high prieſt reigns with them forever and ever? Therefore, as Chriſt appeared to John in his pontifical habit, Rev. i. 13, ſo he will appear forever—'Even 'Jeſus, made an high prieſt forever, after the order of Melchiſe-'dec.' Heb. vi. 20.

The

* *Dr. Edwards againſt Dr. Chauncy*, Chap. xii. Where a more full account may be ſeen of what is meant by Chriſt's delivering up the kingdom to the Father, at the day of judgment; alſo what is meant by his reigning forever.

† Ibid, p. 116.

The unceaſing reign of Chriſt is again decided, Iſai. ix. 7. 'Of the increaſe of his government and peace there ſhall be no 'end.' Luke i. 33. 'He ſhall reign over the houſe of Jacob for-'ever, and of his kingdom there ſhall be no end.' Dan. vii. 14. 'And there was given unto him (the Son of man) dominion, and 'glory, and a kingdom;—his dominion is an everlaſting domin-'ion, which ſhall not paſs away, and his kingdom that which 'ſhall not be deſtroyed.' Thus the endleſs dominion, and glory, and kingdom, and reign of Chriſt is plainly taught in ſcripture. 'Though Chriſt will, at the general judgment, have fin-'iſhed the work of ſaving ſinners from wrath; yet he will with-'out end be the mediator between the Father and the ſaints, and 'will be the medium of all divine communications to them, 'whether of knowledge, of happineſs or of honour.'*

Now it is of the firſt importance to the dear people of God, that this matter ſhould be decided; and decided as we find it is, in the plaineſt manner. It gives them the higheſt conſolation to know that Chriſt, their redeemer and ſaviour, is their king and their head, forever: this is well known by experience. So, in their aſcriptions of praiſe and thankſgiving to Jeſus Chriſt, it is moſt important that the people of God ſhould underſtand their own words.—'Bleſſing, and honour, and glory, and pow-'er, be unto him that ſitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb 'forever & ever.' Rev. v. 13. It is certain that the church has, all along, aſcribed the ſame honour, & power, & might, & *dominion* to God the Son, as to God the Father. They have alſo aſcribed the ſame to the Son, as they have to the Father; as to duration. —Bleſſing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that ſitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb *forever and ever.* Again, it is certain, from this paſſage and many others, that the church has taken their aſcriptions of praiſe, or their doxologies, from the holy ſcriptures. And what can be more intereſting, than for the church to know that this dominion, and power, and glory, is given to the Son, as well as to the Father, forever—to an abſolute eternity? Furthermore, it is moſt intereſting to God's people, for them to be aſſured that the reign of Chriſt is ſtrictly eternal, on account of the promiſes of future bleſſedneſs, made to them in the goſpel. Theſe *promiſes*, as they ſo often ſtand connected with the reign of Chriſt, evidently run parallel with it. Therefore, if the reign of Chriſt is without end, ſo are the bleſſings promiſed to his people; otherwiſe they are not.

But if the words we are now explaining, *eternity* and its derivatives, do not fix the point as to the unceaſing reign of Chriſt, then

* Ibid.

then there are no words of ſcripture which do. The ſame objections, we ſhall yet ſee, lie againſt all others as againſt theſe. So, if theſe do not naturally and directly mean *without end*, neither do others. Thus the neceſſity of taking the direct ſenſe of theſe words to be endleſs duration.

3. It is neceſſary to take the direct and original intent of theſe words to be endleſs duration, that the *promiſes* to believers might enſure to them *eternal ſalvation*. Theſe promiſes are generally made to believers, in ſome one of theſe words. And theſe, *eternal*, *everlaſting*, and the other words we are upon, are joined with the promiſes to believers, tenfold more than all the reſt, uſed in ſcripture for this purpoſe. Now, as the ſame objections lie againſt all others, which promiſe endleſs life to believers, as lie againſt theſe; ſo it is neceſſary to take theſe in the ſtrict, or endleſs ſenſe. If theſe, in their direct import, and, when joined with things of the future world, do not expreſs a ſtrict eternity, then all the promiſes to believers of eternal life wholly fail. On this ground, there is no aſſurance from ſcripture, that believers, or any part of mankind will be finally ſaved. This will, perhaps, be made evident in anſwering objections.

4. In the old teſtament, there are no other words but theſe, which promiſe an abſolute eternity of bleſſedneſs to believers. This univerſaliſts themſelves allow. Or, after they have collected all the words they can, they have cited none from the old teſtament, which they pretend are decidedly to this purpoſe. So they muſt allow, and all of us muſt allow, that theſe words promiſe eternal life, ſtrictly ſuch, to believers; or we muſt deny that the *goſpel of ſalvation* was preached to the ancient Jews. But,

IX. The apoſtle helps to underſtand the ſenſe of theſe words, and to anſwer objections, as in 2. Tim. i. 10.—'By the appear-'ing of our ſaviour Jeſus Chriſt, who hath aboliſhed death, and 'hath brought life and immortality to light through the goſpel.'

Dr. Chauncy thinks this promiſe of 'immortality' to be free from ambiguity, or uncertainty of meaning; containing a concluſive promiſe of endleſs life to believers. The word *immortality* he improves above all others, to determine the final happineſs of the righteous. There are a few other expreſſions he uſes, in connection with this. As, *Incorruption*, *Neither can they die any more*, *Shall not be hurt of the ſecond death*, and *there ſhall be no more death*. Which differ but little, if any, in their meaning, from *immortality*; & the firſt, *Incorruption*, is from the ſame Greek word. So that *immortality* may be conſidered as

Dr.

Dr. C's principal word, & by which he explains *eternal, everlasting*, &c. when joined with promises of salvation to men. From the force of this word, he says that all these promises must necessarily be taken in the endless sense. And, whereas there is no such determinate word, as he says, nor any one like it, joined with the threatenings to the damned, he concludes that these threatenings must be taken in the limited sense.* The truth is, *immortality* is free from ambiguity; but not more so than *eternal*, when applied to *unseen things*.

But this passage shows, in what way, Christ revealed immortality. 'Who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.' The death and resurrection of Christ confirmed all the doctrines of the gospel. The death and resurrection of Christ was the grand, crowning affair, by which every gracious promise, in the bible, was established. The resurrection of Christ was a sure pledge of the resurrection of every believer. And as Christ was raised up to glory, so every believer shall be glorified with him. Furthermore, Christ expressly spoke of a resurrection; and clearly revealed a glorious immortality. In this way, Christ abolished death, or triumphed over it. And in this way, Christ brought immortality to light. Whereas, before Christ's time, this doctrine was comparatively obscured, or seen through the *vail*.

But can we suppose that Christ revealed this interesting doctrine, in no other way except by this word, *immortality?* This word is not to be found in the four gospels. An expression answering to it is found, in Luke xx. 36. 'Neither can they (the 'saints in heaven) die any more.' This is the only one Dr. C. cites out of the gospels, as explanatory of *eternal*. Had there been others, to the same purpose, he ought to have produced them. Has he produced all, and the only one there is, in this case, he ought to have told us of it. Upon careful inspection, as well as his silence for evidence, there is no other expression, in the four gospels, which he would allow, as suited to this end. That in John viii. 51. 'If a man keep my saying, he shall 'never see death,' he would not allow. For in the original it is, 'He shall not see death to eternity.' That in John vi. 50.—'That a man may eat thereof and not die,' is explained in the next verse following: 'If any man eat of this bread, he shall live 'forever.' So that no other words can be found, which are in any sense analogous to those he has produced, and according to his mode of interpretation. Dr. C's scheme then comes to this, Christ has revealed immortality by the above words, in Luke xx. 36, and by these words only has he revealed this doctrine. And immortality

* P. 286, 287, 288.

immortality is not brought to light in the other three gospels. It is granted, one single assertion from the mouth of the saviour is sufficient to bind our faith. But can we suppose that all the offers of life eternal, life everlasting, life forever, &c. &c. were left wholly without explanation? Or that they all depend on one single expression? It is evident the apostles and evangelists did not view it in this light. Had this single expression been the hinge, on which the whole turned, it must have been inserted, it appears, in each one of the Gospels. It is plain from the nature of the case, that the same idea is taught by other words. And that whenever Christ preached the gospel, whenever he preached either the doctrine of the resurrection, or of eternal life, he brought immortality to light. And all the gracious words, which he had previously spoken, were established by his own death and resurrection.

Furthermore, immortality was, in a measure, revealed and understood, before Christ's time. Christ grounds his assertion of the resurrection, and that the saints in heaven 'shall die no more,' on what 'Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord 'the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of 'Jacob.' These words refer to the *covenant* God made with Abraham; which covenant was still in force. Christ adds, 'For 'he is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto 'him.' All who are in covenant with God, as Abraham, & still is alive to God, or live forever. For the everlasting covenant God made with Abraham, means a covenant that never ends; continues while God lives. God still calls himself the God of Abraham. Implying that his covenant included that body of Abraham's which sleeps in the dust, & that soul of his which is in paradise; and that this body should again awake to immortal life. Because the Sadducees did not believe this, Christ said to them, 'ye do err, not knowing the 'scriptures:' not knowing what was revealed by Moses, and spoken to Abraham. Thus the doctrine of a resurrection and immortality was taught among the primitive saints. Christ informs that it was taught by the words of the covenant, as he refers to the covenant. God revealed himself to Abraham as the *everlasting God*;* and made with him an *everlasting covenant*. By this, the ancient saints were enabled to see, within the *vail*, a resurrection to immortal life. The death and resurrection of Christ, as the apostle teaches, took away the *vail*, and brought this glorious doctrine to light.

Hence it is clear, the saints of old learned this interesting doctrine by the force of the word *everlasting*, joined with the *covenant*,

* Gen. 21. 33.

venant, and with the gracious promiſes which were ſo many parts of the covenant. One ſcripture, it is granted, helps to explain another. But we now ſee that *everlaſting* helps to explain *immortal*, as well as *immortal* helps to explain *everlaſting*. For by everlaſting life, included in the everlaſting covenant, the Jews underſtood an immortal life. And from the ſame covenant *Chriſt* argues an immortal life.

All will grant, the Jews believed in immortality. But they muſt have received this doctrine from the common words, *eternal*, *everlaſting*, &c. Abraham and the patriarchs had no other words, as we have any account of, by which they could learn it. Or the words of the covenant were, to ſay the leaſt, as forcible as any words they had. Therefore, by virtue of *eternal*, or *everlaſting*, they learned the doctrine of immortality. Therefore, *eternal* is as concluſive as *immortal*. And the former is ſuited to determine endleſs duration as well as the latter.

X. The apoſtle ſettles the meaning of theſe words, in 2 Cor. iv. 18. 'The things which are ſeen are temporal, but the things 'which are not ſeen are eternal.' The term *things* is here uſed in the greateſt latitude; meaning all things & beings in the univerſe. The divine being; angels and glorified ſpirits; devils and damned ſpirits; with all things belonging to both theſe claſſes: theſe are the things which are not ſeen. Theſe things which are not ſeen, are put in oppoſition to things which are ſeen. And the things which are eternal, are put in oppoſition to things which are temporal.

But where is the contraſt, if *eternal* mean only for an age? To make out his ſcheme, Dr. Chauncy confounds *temporal* and *eternal* together. Whereas the apoſtle makes a diſtinction. But if *eternal*, in this place, do not mean ſtrictly eternal, the diſtinction is loſt. An age of a thouſand years, or ever ſo long, if limited, cannot be diſtinguiſhed from *temporal*; for this is a temporal duration. So that the apoſtle, by this diſtinction between *temporal* and *eternal*, gives the ſenſe of *eternal*. And as it is always to be taken when applied to things of the next world. Becauſe, by things which are not ſeen, he means, in general, all things of the next world; and, by things which are ſeen, all things of this world. Therefore, unleſs we would make the apoſtle confound things together, we muſt conſider all unſeen things, to be things which will endure without end. Which gives the ſenſe of *eternal*, when applied to theſe things.

Again, the apoſtle has here taught us how to take the ſenſe of *eternal*, or *everlaſting*, or *forever*, when joined with things which are ſeen. In this caſe, although the ſenſe of it in ſome

certain

certain view, is unlimited, yet the things which are ſeen, all earthly things, bear no proportion with reſpect to duration, to the things of the inviſible world. *Everlaſting*, joined with the land of Canaan, gives ſeveral unlimited ideas. Yet this earthly poſſeſſion, of itſelf, bears no proportion, in duration, with the heavenly poſſeſſion. This interpretation is confirmed by the words ſtanding with the above, or by the 17th verſe. 'For our light 'affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more 'exceeding and eternal weight of glory.' All earthly things, whether they give afflictions or comforts, are but for a moment; while this exceeding glory, which awaits believers, is eternal. But a moment is an indiviſible particle of time. The meaning is, time cannot meaſure with eternity. The former bears no proportion to the latter. And the duration of the things that are ſeen, bears no proportion to the duration of things unſeen.

But this diſtinction is wholly loſt, unleſs we give the word *eternal*, when joined with unſeen things, its proper meaning. To explain the ſenſe of this word, as it is uſed in the above paſſage, and as it is always uſed, in the New Teſtament, when applied to things of the coming world; Dr. Edwards ſays, 'To 'ſuppoſe, that in this inſtance it means the duration of an age or 'diſpenſation only, would deſtroy all oppoſition between things 'ſeen and things unſeen; becauſe many of the former continue 'for an age or diſpenſaion' as well as the latter. The bare wri-'ting of this paſſage, ſo as to expreſs a limited duration, ſufficiently confutes that ſenſe: thus, The things which are ſeen, are 'temporal; but the things which are unſeen, continue for an 'age or diſpenſation.'*

As the apoſtle makes a diſtinction between temporal and eternal things, it appears impoſſible to avoid the force of his words. To ſay, he intends heavenly things only, which are allowed to be endleſs, according to the literal ſenſe of *eternal;* and that this is ſaying nothing about the ſtate of the damned, whether it will be longer or ſhorter: This is granting *eternal* to mean *endleſs*, and this is all for which we now contend. Again, to ſay, that *eternal*, when joined with heavenly things, *may* be taken in the endleſs ſenſe, not from the force of the word, but from the nature of the ſubject to which it is joined, as the nature of heavenly things is durable and unceaſing; this will not help the caſe. The apoſtle does not make a conditional, but a poſitive diſtinction between theſe two ſubjects, temporal and eternal things. And in this ſenſe he uſes the words, in oppoſition to each other. 'The things which are ſeen are temporal, but the things which

* Againſt Dr. C. p. 254.

'are not ſeen are eternal.' From this poſitive mode of aſſertion, the ſenſe of *eternal*, in its proper import, muſt be diſtinct from *temporal*. But there can be no abſolute diſtinction, in this caſe, ſhort of conſidering eternal things to be ſuch as have no end. Furthermore, how do we know any thing about the nature of the ſubject, further than God has revealed it? And how has he revealed celeſtial things, to be ever durable, unleſs it be by certain words? And if the ſenſe of *eternal*, and the other like words, be denied, what words have we left? It may yet more fully appear, on Dr. C's plan, we have none left, to determine the ſtrict eternity of any ſubject. But if we know, from the nature of the ſubject, that heavenly things are abſolutely eternal, why are *eternal*, and *everlaſting*, ſo often joined with theſe things? And why are they joined ſo often with them, in a poſitive manner, and without any explanation? Or why are not the words, *temporal* and *eternal*, or time and eternity, uſed in ſcripture promiſcuouſly? Perhaps the objector would ſay, that *eternal* may be taken either in the limited or unlimited ſenſe; but *temporal* ever means a limited duration. Or the ſenſe of *temporal* is fixed and certain; but *eternal* is an ambiguous term! This is the ſame as to ſay, The apoſtle, to make a poſitive diſtinction, uſes an ambiguous term in oppoſition to one that is fixed and certain. And pretends to make a *certain* diſtinction between things ſeen and things unſeen; then leaves us wholly in the dark, ſo as we cannot tell whether there is a diſtinction between them, or not. Alſo, leaves us wholly in the dark as to the duration of unſeen things. Thus, 'The things 'which are ſeen come to an end, but the things which are not 'ſeen either continue without end, or come to an end.' The moſt ignorant pagan knows this. The moſt ignorant pagan knows, that unſeen things either do, or do not, come to an end. He knows that the ſoul, either is, or is not immortal. So that this is no revelation as to inviſible things. Immortality is not here brought to light. Hence, we are driven to theſe two things. Either, firſt, of running into the above inconſiſtency, if not blaſphemy, of making the apoſtle ſpeak perfect nonſenſe; or, ſecondly, of holding that he means by this ſimple word, *eternal*, in oppoſition to *temporal*, to fix the abſolute, unceaſing duration of unſeen things.

I am, &c.

LETTER

LETTER II.

The Greek and Hebrew words, from which eternity *and its* derivatives *are tranſlated, examined; the inſtances of their uſe in ſcripture, enumerated; and remarks upon ſome of the inſtances that are the moſt important and decided.*

MY DEAR FRIEND,

THE ſubject before us needing no further introduction, we proceed as follows,

I. The Greek noun is AIOON,* *eternity*; and its adjective is AIOONIOS, *eternal* or *everlaſting*. AIOON is derived from, or rather made up of, two words, AEI *always*, and OON *exiſting*; that is, *always exiſting*. As Dr. Strong juſtly obſerves, 'The moſt natural ſignification of theſe words (AIOON 'and AIOONIOS) from their derivation is exiſting always. 'Theſe words apply more pertinently than any other in the 'Greek language to duration without end. Thoſe who en- 'deavour to underſtand them in any other ſenſe, muſt ſtill allow 'that this is their natural meaning; and muſt recur to a figura- 'tive uſe, to accommodate them to their own ſcheme.'†

II. The Greeks applied AIOON to this world. Not ſimply to this earth, creatures, and the men of the world; for this they had another word, KOSMOS. But they applied it to this ſtate of exiſtence; including divine providence, and the ſucceſſive generations of men, with the various things and events of this preſent ſtate. The fact appears to be this; they ſuppoſed there would be a generation of men in ſucceſſion, with the ſame divine providence, circumſtances and things, without end. The world, they ſuppoſed would laſt forever. Therefore they called it the AIOON, the *always-living*, or the *exiſting-forever*. Therefore AIOON, in its original ſenſe, means *forever*. The Greeks might uſe it in a limited ſenſe, but this was out of its natural courſe; this is evident from the derivation of this word, as well as the manner of its uſe.

This explains one certain uſe of it in ſcripture. Here, AIOON is ſometimes applied to the Jewiſh ſtate; and, into our language, is commonly tranſlated *world*. *The end of the world*, is a phraſe ſometimes uſed, to mean the end of the Jewiſh ſtate, as in Matt. xxiv. 3. The Jews held to two ages or grand diviſions

* The double vowel, or *OO*, is here intended to anſwer to the long *O*, or *omega*, in the Greek; and ſhould be pronounced with only two articulations, or as a word of two ſyllables, as *AIOWN*. So the *Eta* or long *E*, in Greek, is hereafter written with *EE*.

† *Benevolence and Miſery*, p. 95, 96.

viſions of time. One was the age before the coming of the Meſſiah, and the other after. Theſe are called worlds, as in 1 Cor. x. 11. 'Upon whom the ends of the *worlds* are come,' as it might be rendered. Again, AIOON is applied, *generally*, to the world, or to the whole ſtate of exiſtence from the beginning to the end of time. As in Matt. xxviii. 20. 'Lo, I am 'with you alway, even unto the end of the world, SUNTELEI-'AS TOU AIOONOS.' AIOON is alſo uſed *generally*, when applied to the inviſible ſtate. Mark x. 30. 'In the world 'to come (TOO AIOONI TOO ERCHOMENOO) life ev-'erlaſting.' We ſometimes mention the world to come, ſimply; and then add ſome other word to expreſs the duration intended. Now, divine wiſdom ſaw fit to apply the ſame word to our preſent ſtate of exiſtence as was commonly uſed among the Greeks. And it anſwered this important purpoſe; it made it certain to Greeks and Jews that this world, and what the Greeks held to be without end, muſt come to an end. It was natural and neceſſary for the ſame word, in the New Teſtament eſpecially, to be applied to the preſent ſtate of exiſtence, as was uſed among the Greeks. This, inſtead of being an argument that this word does not primarily intend, endleſs duration, is a ſtrong argument to the contrary. For if this word, as univerſaliſts ſay, in its primary meaning intends an age that muſt come to an end; there was then no need that ſcripture ſhould expreſsly teach the Greeks, that their AIOON, *exiſtence*, or *world*, ſhould come to an end. And becauſe they applied an unlimited word to a wrong object, this is no evidence that this certain word does not originally mean endleſs duration. Eſpecially, as they ſuppoſed the object, to which it was ſo applied, was to continue without end. Likewiſe, AIOON, which primarily includes *exiſtence*, *diſpenſation*, *world*, or *ſtate*, which alſo means an eternal ſtate, is applied to the Jewiſh ſtate: this is to convince Greek and Jew that even this *ſtate* ſhould come to an end. There is no ambiguity in uſing an unlimited term, in a limited ſenſe, when ſuch limitation is plainly expreſſed, or neceſſarily underſtood. In this way is uſed every unlimited term.

Furthermore, we hence ſee why, in the uſe of the expreſſion, *world without end*,* the words *without end*, ſeem to be an addition to the word, *world*. The Greeks had no idea of a world that has an end. The ſimple term, AIOON, *world*, was with them an eternal world, or an *eternity*. But,

III. In the New Teſtament, AIOON, when uſed in a limited ſenſe, to mean the Jewiſh ſtate or this world, is always uſed without

* Iſai. 45. 17.

without the prepoſition EIS. In this way we here find it in a number of inſtances. But when uſed in an unlimited ſenſe, or applied to things of the next world, it is governed by the prepoſition EIS ; as EIS TON AIOONA. In this conſtruction, it occurs in a great number of inſtances. And is always ſo uſed in the New Teſtament, when joined with things of the next world, except a few inſtances, which will be hereafter explained.

This gives us things in a plain and correct manner. There is no ambiguity in applying AIOON, when uſed without the prepoſition EIS, to the Jewiſh ſtate, or to the world in general. The Greeks ſo uſed it, as we have already ſeen. But, to diſtinguiſh the uſe of it, when applied to things of the coming world, or things which have no end, the prepoſition EIS is joined with it. Every one, acquainted with the dead languages, knows that EIS TON AIOONA was an unlimited expreſſion, or gave an unlimited idea, among the ancient Greeks. It anſwered to the infinitive mood in our language ; or as when the prepoſition, *to*, is joined with an objective caſe. And inſtead of being rendered, *forever*, as it commonly is in the new teſtament, it might as well be rendered, *to eternity*. In no language can an expreſſion be found, but what may be limited by other words, or by the ſubject to which it is joined. But if this does not expreſs an *abſolute eternity*, when it is not limited, there is none in the bible that does. When this term, however, is limited, the limitation is obvious, wherever it is found in the ſacred volume. This we might expect, as it is of the firſt importance that the two ſubjects, *time* and *eternity*, ſhould be kept diſtinct.

The uſe of the adjective, or derivative of AIOON, further confirms what is ſaid above. This adjective, AIOONIOS *eternal* or *everlaſting*, is uſed in the new teſtament in a great number of inſtances ; and almoſt, or wholly without exception is applied to things of the coming world ; things which have no end, as will hereafter be ſhown. As, therefore, the derivative, *eternal*, is ſo generally applied to unſeen things which are ſtrictly eternal ; ſo the primitive word, or rather EIS TON AIOONA, *to eternity*, muſt intend a ſtrict eternity.

IV. We ſhall enumerate the inſtances of the uſe of AIOON and AIOONIOS, in ſcripture ; begin with the old teſtament ; and make remarks, as we paſs along, on ſome that are the moſt important and decided.

But in tracing the uſe of theſe Greek words, through this part of ſcripture, the principal object is, that we might be able to

meet

meet the objections of Univerſaliſts. Dr. Chauncy and others have followed the Septuagint, or Greek verſion of the old teſtament, inſtead of the Hebrew, to make out their ſenſe of *forever* and *everlaſting*. But the Hebrew muſt here determine their original ſenſe. To effect the object, we ſhall be obliged to attend minutely, and to enumerate every particular inſtance.

As another prerequiſite, we muſt keep in mind what was ſtated in the laſt Letter, relative to the *typical* uſe of theſe words. AIOON and AIOONIOS. *forever* and *everlaſting*, are, in the old teſtament, often applied to a compound object, the ſhadow and the ſubſtance. The ſhadow being a fading thing, only for a day or a time, while the ſubſtance is truly everlaſting.

Again, there are other Greek words, or words in the Septuagint, aſide from theſe under conſideration, which are tranſlated, *forever*. As, EIS TELOS (to the end, or at the end), which occurs ſixteen times;* and EIS NIKOS (continually), which is found in four inſtances.† Alſo, the Greek words anſwering to, *all my days, all thy days, all the days of the Iſraelites, throughout their generations, the utmoſt of my days, while I live*, are ſometimes rendered, *forever*.‡

We now come to the intended object. And, in the Septuagint, EIS TON AIOONA is the common phraſe to expreſs *forever*, and it is here uſed for this end, more than all the others, as we ſhall preſently ſee. There are other conſtructions of AIOON, without the prepoſition EIS, uſed for this purpoſe: As EOOS AIOONOS, DI AIOONOS, &c. which are found in fifty inſtances. Fifteen of theſe are *typical*, or joined to typical things;§ three figurative;‖ and the remainder in the endleſs ſenſe.¶ As may be ſeen by examining the quotations below.

Forever

* The places are, 1 Chron xxviii. 9. (If thou forſake him, he will caſt thee off forever, or at the end.) Job xiv. 20. xx. 7 xxiii 7. Pſal. xiii. 1. xvi 11. xliv. 23. xlix. 9. lii. 5. lxviii. 16. lxxiv. 1. 10. 19 lxxvii. 8. lxxix. 5. lxxxix. 46.

† The places are, 2 Sam ii. 26 Job xxx. 7. Lam. iv. 20. Amos i. 11.

‡ Gen. xiii. 9. xliv. 32. Deut. iv. 40. 1 Sam. ii. 32. 35. 2 Chron. xxi. 7. Pſal. xxiii. 6. xciii. 5.——Numb xxiv. 20, 24, is tranſlated, *periſh forever*, inſtead of *utterly periſh*. Job iv. 20, *deſtroyed forever*, inſtead of *utterly deſtroyed*. Joſh. iv. 24, that ye might fear the LORD your God *forever*, inſtead of, *in all your work*, or *in all thou doſt*. In Iſai. xxx. 8. the words are, *forever*, inſtead of, *long time*. In Micah vii. 18, *forever* is rendered from a negative particle.

§ The places are, Gen. xiii. 15. Deut. xxviii. 46. Joſh. iv. 7. 1 Sam. ii. 30. 2 Sam. vii. 16. 1 Chron. xvii 12, 14 twice xxii. 12 twice. 2 Chron. vii. 16. Pſal. cxxxii. 12. Iſai. lx. 21. Jerem. xvii. 25. xxxi. 40.

‖ 1 Sam. ii. 26. 1 King. xii. 7. 2 King. v. 27.

¶ Deut. v. 29. xii. 28. 1 Sam. iii. 13, 14 xx. 23. 42. 2 Sam. iii. 28. vii. 24, 26, xxii. 51. 1 Chron. xvii. 22, 24. Nehem. xiii. 1. Pſal. xviii. 50. xxv. 6. xxviii. 9. xlviii. 14. lxvi. 7. lxxxix. 4. cvi. 32. cxiii. 2. cxv. 18. cxxi. 8. cxxv. 2. cxxxi. 3. cxxxiii.

Forever and ever, translated from EOOS AIOONOS TOON AIOONOON, and from other constructions of AIOON without the preposition EIS, occurs eight times. Two of them are used typically,* and the rest in the unlimited sense.†

With the preposition EIS, AIOON, when translated *forever*, or into other words of like import, is found, throughout the Septuagint, two hundred and seven times. Eighteen of these are EIS TON AIOONA TOU AIOONOS, and other formations of the above word, which are rendered, *forever and ever*. Seven are EIS TOUS AIOONAS, the plural of AIOON, joined with the above preposition; and translated, *forever*. Eight are EIS AIOONA AIOONOS, and rendered in the same manner. The remainder of this number is made up wholly of EIS TON AIOONA. This phrase, therefore, is the common one to express *forever*, and used more in the Septuagint, for this purpose, than all the rest. This further confirms what has been said of the absolute unlimited meaning of this phrase, when directly used, or not limited. So this helps to confirm its use in the new testament, as may yet more fully appear.

Twenty-one of the forementioned two hundred and seven instances are *typical*, or applied to the shadow and substance;‡ sixteen are *figurative*;§ all the rest, which is one hundred and seventy, means endless duration, and can be taken in no other sense, as may be seen from the marginal note.¶

And

cxxxiii. 3. Isai. xxvi. 4. xxxii. 17. Jerem. xx. 11. xxxv. 6 Zech. i. 5. Mal. i. 4. Isai. xlv. 17. EOO, TOU AIOONOS ETI. world without end; here the ETI seems to be an addition, for reasons hereafter to be given.

* Jerem. vii. 7. xxv. 5.

† Exod. xv. 18. 1 Chron. xvi. 36. xxix. 10. Nehem. ix. 5. Dan. ii. 20. vii. 18.

‡ The places are, Exod. xxxii. 13. Josh. xiv. 9. 2 Sam. viii. 13, 16, 29 twice. 1 King. ix. 3. 1 Chron. xxix. 18. 2 Chron. xxx. 8. xxxiii. 4. Psal. lxi. 4. cxxxii. 14. cxlviii. 6. Jerem. xvii. 25. Ezek. xxxvii. 25 twice, 26. 28. xliii. 7. 9. To which may be added Isai. xxxiv. 17; which is EIS TON AIOONA CHRONON.

§ Exod. xxi. 6. Levit. xxv. 46. Deut. xiii. 16. xv. 17. Josh. viii. 28. 1 Sam. xxvii. 12. 1 King. i. 31. 2 King. v. 27. Nehem. ii. 3. Eccl. i. 4. Isai. xxxiv. 10. Dan. iii. 9. v. 10. vi. 6, 21. To this is added Isai. xxx. 8, rendered *forever and ever*.

¶ Gen. iii. 22. Exod. xiv. 13. xix. 9. Deut. xxiii. 6. xxix. 29. xxxii. 40. Judg. ii. 1. 1 King. x. 9. 1 Chron. xvi. 34. 41. xvii. 27 twice. 2 Chron. v. 13. vii. 3, 6. ix. 8. xx. 21. Ezra iii. 11. Job vii. 16. Psal. v. 11. ix. 7, 18. xii. 7. xv. 5. xix. 9. xxi. 6. xxii. 26. xxix. 10. xxx. 6, 12. xxxi. 1. xxxvii. 18. 27, 28, 29. xli. 12. xliv. 8. xlv. 2. xlix. 8, 9, 11. lii. 9. lv. 22. lxi. 7, 8. lxxi, 1. lxxii. 17. lxxiii. 26. lxxv. 9. lxxvii, 7. lxxix. 13. lxxxi. 15. lxxxiii. 17. lxxxv. 5. lxxxvi. 12. lxxxix. 1, 2, 28, 29, 36, 37, 52. xcii. 7, 8. cii. 28. ciii. 9. civ. 31. cv. 8. cvi. 1. cvii. 1. cx. 4. cxi. 3, 5. 8. 9. 10. cxii. 3. 6, 9. cxvii. 2. cxviii. 1, 2. 3. 4 cxix. 89, 93, 160. cxxxv. 13. cxxxvi. throughout. cxxxviii. 8. cxlvi. 6, 10. Prov. x. 30. xxvii. 24. Eccl. ii. 16. iii. 14. ix. 6. Isai. ix. 7. xiv. 20. xxv. 2. xxxiii. 20. xl. 8. xlvii. 7. li. 6, 8. lvii.

—By examining theſe texts, it is found that twenty, or more, of this number are uſed as poſitive and unexceptional denials. Namely, that ſuch an event ſhall no more return, that ſuch a thing ſhall never be, that ſuch a thing ſhall have a final end, or that ſuch a thing ſhall never end. As, Exod. xiv. 13. 'The 'Egyptians whom ye have ſeen to-day, ye ſhall ſee them again 'no more *forever*.' Pſal. xv. 5. 'He that doeth theſe things 'ſhall *never* be moved, OU SULENTHEESETAI *EIS TON 'AIOONA*, ſhall not be rejected, or caſt away of God, *to eter-'nity*. Pſal. xxx. 6. 'In proſperity I ſaid, I ſhall *never* be 'moved.' lxxi. 1. 'Let me *never* be put to confuſion.' cxix. 93. 'I will *never* forget thy precepts.' Prov. xxvii. 24. 'Riches are not *forever*.' Dan. ii. 44. 'In the days of theſe 'kings ſhall the God of heaven ſet up a kingdom, which ſhall '*never* be deſtroyed.'

EIS TON AIOONA, out of the Septuagint, is fifteen times tranſlated *never*. All which caſes are ſome of the moſt plain and poſitive negations of any to be found. It is remarkable, to make a decided and unexceptionable denial, this phraſe is generally uſed in the Septuagint. But if theſe texts do not expreſs *endleſs duration*, it cannot be expreſſed by words. The bare reading of theſe texts, in Dr. Chauncy's words, is ſufficient to confound his idea. Thus, in his words, 'He that doeth theſe 'things ſhall not be moved *for an age*.' 'Riches are *not for 'an age*.' &c. &c.

Again, about forty of the above number expreſs the duration of divine mercy. As in Pſal. cxxxvi. and ſeveral other places. Had there been words to expreſs boundleſs duration, more emphatically than theſe, 'The mercy of the LORD endureth *for-'ever*, *EIS TON AIOONA* TO ELEOS AUTOU;' we muſt conclude that the holy Spirit would have choſen them. The ſame phraſe is taken to expreſs the duration of his righteouſneſs, and of his judgments.*

One more text may be remarked out of the above number, and the reſt left to the examination of the reader. Deut. xxxii. 39, 40. 'I, even I, am he, and there is no God with me: I 'kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal: neither is there 'any

lvii. 16. lix. 21. Jerem. iii. 5, 12. xxxiii. 11. xxxiv. 10. l. 39. li. 26, 62. Lam. iii. 31. v. 19. Ezek. xxvi. 21. xxvii. 36. xxviii. 19. Dan. ii. 4, 44 twice. iv. 34. xii. 7. Hoſea ii. 19, 26, 27. Joel iii. 20. Obadi. 10. Mich. iv. 7. To which is added the following, rendered *forever and ever*. Pſal. ix. 5. x. 16. xxi. 4. xlv. 6. 17. xlviii. 14. lii. 8. cxi. 8. cxix. 44. cxlv. 1, 2, 21. Iſai. xxx. 8. Dan. xii. 3. Mic. iv. 5.——EIS TON AIOONA, in Pſal. c. 5. cxix. 142, 144, is tranſlated *everlaſting*.

* Pſal. cxi. 3. cxii. 3, 9. cxix. 160.

'any that can deliver out of my hand. For I lift my hand to 'heaven, and ſay, *I live forever*, *ZOO EGOO EIS TON 'AIOONA.*' In this moſt ſolemn manner, the Almighty ſwears, as it is in the Greek, by his right hand lifted up to heaven, and ſays, *I live forever.* Had there been better words than theſe, or better than the original Hebrew, to expreſs his own *Eternity*, doubtleſs he would have choſen them.

Theſe things help to explain the *figurative* uſe of *forever.*—When Daniel ſaid to Darius, 'O king, live forever '* it is plain from the nature of the caſe, that he meant to adopt the ſtrongeſt expreſſion then in uſe, or certainly one as ſtrong as any. It would have been an inſult to Darius, had Daniel wiſhed him to live *for an age*, or *for ages, whether longer or ſhorter*, as in Dr. C's words. Although the prophet uſed this phraſe, *live forever*, hyperbolically, in ſome ſenſe; yet he might, and undoubtedly did, wiſh all poſſible good to his king: long life here, and eternal life hereafter. None, therefore, but an expreſſion ſtrictly unlimited, in its primitive ſenſe, could have anſwered his purpoſe. And when it is ſaid, 'The earth 'abideth forever,' Eccl. i. 4; this is a ſtrong *figure*, to denote the ſtability of the earth, compared to other things. But, in Dr. Chauncy's line of arguing, words cannot be uſed in a figurative ſenſe; or, with him, there is no ſuch thing as an hyperbole. Thus, in his language, 'One generation paſſeth away, and ano-'ther generation cometh: but the earth abideth *for an age*, EIS 'TON AIOONA,' in the ſingular number. Unleſs we would deny the uſe of tropes and figures, we muſt, therefore, allow that an unlimited term, one giving an unlimited idea, may be uſed contrary to its primitive ſenſe.

Again, the *typical* uſe of *forever* ſhows that, naturally and originally, it means endleſs duration. This will preſently be conſidered.

We now come to the adjective AIOONIOS, *eternal* or *everlaſting*, as it occurs in the Septuagint. And here it is found in eighty-eight inſtances. Four of which are *figurative*,† forty-eight are *typical*,‡ the remainder have no other than an unlim-

Z ited

* Chap. 6. 21.

† The places are, Ezek. xxxv. 5. Jonah ii. 6. Hab. iii. 6, twice.

‡ The places are, Gen. ix. 16. xvii. 7, 8, 13, 19. xlviii. 4. Levit. xvi. 34. xxiv. 8. Numb. xxv. 13. 2 Sam. xxiii. 5. 1 Chron. xvi. 17. Pſal. cv. 10. Iſai. xxiv. 5. lv. 3. lxi. 8. Jerem. xxxii. 4. xxxvii. 26. To which is added the following inſtances of AIWVIOS, tranſlated *forever*. Exod. xii. 14, 17, 24. xxvii. 21. xxviii. 43. xxx. 21. xxxi. 17. Levit. vi. 18. vii. 34, 36. x. 8, 9, 15. xvi. 31 xxiii. 14, 21, 31, 41. Numb. x. 8. xv. 15. xviii. 11, 19, 23. xix. 10. Again, may be added theſe, tranſlated *perpetual*. Gen. ix. 12. Exod. xxxi. 16. Levit. xxiv. 9. xxv. 34. Numb. xix. 21. Jerem. xviii. 16. li. 39.

The

ited meaning.* They are descriptive of the attributes of Deity, the rewards of the righteous and the wicked, and the duration of Christ's kingdom. As, 'The *everlasting* God.' 'In the LORD 'JEHOVAH is *everlasting* strength.' 'The righteous shall be in *ev-* 'erlasting remembrance.' 'I (God) will bring an *everlasting* re- 'proach upon you (the false prophets and their adherents,) and 'a *perpetual* shame, which shall not be forgotten.' 'His (Christ's) 'dominion is an *everlasting* dominion, which *shall not pass* 'away.'

The view we had, in the last Letter, of the reign and kingdom of Christ, which is to last to an absolute eternity; this helps to confirm the promises of future blessedness to the saints. For all these promises run parallel with the duration of his reign and kingdom. And these things serve to explain the *typical* use of *everlasting*. A *type*, as has been said, is a shadow, set to represent a substance; & that which fades away, is set to represent that which fades not away. A type is a temporal thing, representing that which is eternal. As when God promised to David, concerning his son Solomon; 'He shall build an house for my name, and he shall be my 'son, and I will be his father, and I will establish the throne of his 'kingdom over Israel forever.'† The substance of what was promised by this typical kingdom of David's or Solomon's, had its fulfilment in Christ. And this throne, established in the line of David, which was of temporal duration, *throughout their generations*, promised the endless reign of Christ. The throne of Christ's kingdom is here promised to be strictly forever. So it is

The above text, Jonah ii. 6, 'The earth with her bars, was about me *forever*,' is, according to the Greek, so according to the Hebrew, 'The *everlasting* bars of the 'earth were about me.' Again, the above, Gen. ix. 16. 'The *bow* shall be in the 'cloud,—that I may remember the *everlasting* covenant between God and every liv- 'ing creature.' This to Noah, was strictly *everlasting*. The same *bow*, Rev. iv. 3, is made a token of God's endless faithfulness to his saints. As an appendage to this, covenant with Noah, God will not any more smite every thing living; as he has done, while the earth remaineth————.

* The places are, Gen. xxi. 33. Psal. xxiv. 7, 9. cxii. 6. cxxxix. 24. Prov. x. 25. Isai. xxvi. 4. xxxiii. 14. xlv. 17. li. 11. liv. 8. lv. 13. lvi. 5. lx. 5, 15, 19, 20. lxi. 7. lxiii. 12. Jerem. xxiii. 40. xxxi. 3. Ezek. xvi. 60. Dan. iv. 3, 34. vii. 14. xii. 2, twice.—These, rendered, *forever*, are added, Exod. iii. 15. Micah ii. 9.—These also, rendered *perpetual*, Psal. lxxviii. 66. Jerem. v. 22. xxiii. 40. xxv. 9, 12. l. 5. Ezek. xxxv. 9.

Psal. xli. 13. xc. 2. ciii. 17 cvi. 48. 'From *everlasting* to *everlasting*;' and the same in the Greek and Hebrew as from *eternity* to *eternity*.—Psal. xciii. 2. Prov. viii. 23. Isai. lxiii. 16. Micah v. 2. Hab. i. 12. 'From *everlasting*;' the same as from *eternity*.—Deut. xxxiii. 27. THEOUARCHEE. eternal God.

** Considerable labour has been spent to make a correct statement. It is not pretended, however, and for the want of a Greek Concordance to the Old Testament, but that some few instances, both of AIOON and AIOONIOS, have been overlooked.

† 1 Chron. xxii. 10.

is interpreted in Luke i. 32, 33. 'The Lord God ſhall give unto 'him (JESUS) the throne of his father David: And he ſhall 'reign over the houſe of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there 'ſhall be no end.' Thus, in the new teſtament, the vail is taken away, the ſhadow or type removed, for the ſubſtance to appear. And nothing is plainer in ſcripture, than that David was ſet as a type of Chriſt. All ſuch promiſes, therefore, made to him, contained, behind the curtain, promiſes made to Chriſt. They contained promiſes of earthly or temporal bleſſings to David, and his ſeed after him; but the grand thing intended was the eternal bleſſedneſs of Chriſt and his people.

The ſame is taught by the promiſes made to Abraham. As in Gen. xvii. 7, 8. 'I will eſtabliſh my covenant between me and 'thee, and thy ſeed after thee, in their generations, for an ever-'laſting covenant; to be a God unto thee, and to thy ſeed after 'thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy ſeed after thee, 'the land wherein thou art a ſtranger, all the land of Canaan, 'for an *everlaſting* poſſeſſion.' This covenant and promiſe to Abraham evidently had a two-fold meaning, including both temporal and eternal things. That which was only temporal, or the earthly Canaan in itſelf, was for Abraham and his ſeed to poſſeſs, while the Abrahamic diſpenſation laſted; and to this period it was limited. Or it expired at the coming of the Meſſiah: 'Be-'tween me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee, *in their genera-'tions.*' The Meſſiah was the grand ſeed promiſed, and his advent completed theſe generations of Abraham. A belief of this, as it appears, was one ſpecial article of Abraham's faith. And, it is here remarkable, theſe words, 'In their generations,' 'Throughout their generations,' &c. make a part of the Abrahamic covenant, or they are a neceſſary appendage to it. Where they are not expreſſed, they are neceſſarily underſtood. Which left no ground for miſtake. This everlaſting grant of Canaan, as an earthly inheritance only, was in force till the coming of Chriſt, and no longer.* This everlaſting grant, at the ſame time, typifyed and promiſed, to all the righteous, an eternal inheritance in heaven.

The ſame is remarkable as to the Levitical ſtatutes and ordinances.—'A ſtatute forever unto him (Aaron), and his ſeed af-'ter him.'—'A ſtatute forever in your generations.'—'A ſtatute 'forever throughout their generations.'† Theſe words, 'Through-'out their generations,' &c. ſo often occur in this connection, as to leave no room for deception. The plain meaning was, theſe ordi-

nances

* The Jews would have held Canaan, after the coming of Chriſt, and to the end of time, by natural right; had they not been ejected, for their ſins, by the judgments of heaven. † Exod. xxviii. 43. Levit. vi. 18. vii. 36.

nances were never to ceaſe while the prieſthood of Aaron laſted. And this was given to Phinehas as a covenant of *peace*, and fidelity on his part, for an *everlaſting* prieſthood. On condition of Phinehas and his ſeed abiding faithful in this covenant, God hereby barred, to a ſtrict eternity, every other tribe and family from the prieſthood. That the prieſthood of Aaron, however, was to expire, was plainly intimated by the words, 'Throughout their generations.' And as theſe ordinances were only 'a ſhadow of good things to come,'* it was nothing but criminal blindneſs in the Jews, to believe that they were not to be ſuperceded by the promiſed Meſſiah. In this light it is ſtated by the apoſtles; and with reference to paſt ages, as well as to the time then preſent. So that, as in this caſe, when *everlaſting* or *forever* is reſtricted, this reſtriction is obvious. But it was only the ſhadow which was limited, or the type was reſtricted, to the coming of the Antitype. The prieſthood of Aaron was to teach the Jews the unchangeable and eternal prieſthood of Chriſt. The prieſthood of Aaron is therefore to be conſidered in a two-fold ſenſe. 'Throughout their generations,' i. e. limiting the uſe of the type to the advent of the Antitype. And, as Aaron in an eminent manner acted in Chriſt's ſtead, or as his repreſentative, ſo Aaron's prieſthood, in ſome proper ſenſe, might be called an everlaſting prieſthood. Or the prieſthood of Chriſt, the ſubſtance inſtead of the ſhadow, included in theſe ordinances, was ſtrictly everlaſting. The words of the apoſtle are a confirmation of this; Heb. xiii. 20.——— 'That great Shepherd of the ſheep, through the blood of the '*everlaſting* covenant:' evidently refering to the Aaronical covenant.

Again, as to the covenant made with Abraham, or the bleſſings of the land of Canaan, it is evident theſe things were received in a two-fold ſenſe, temporal and eternal. Or all theſe temporal bleſſings promiſed and ſecured endleſs bleſſings to the righteous. In theſe earthly, fading things, there were wrapt up, included, or promiſed, things reſerved in heaven, which fade not away. Therefore, the words *everlaſting*, *eternal*, &c. had their ſtrict and natural meaning among the Jews. To deny this, is to deny that the Jews and ancient patriarchs had the goſpel preached among them.† The apoſtle makes the *reſt*, God gave his people in Canaan, an emblem of that *reſt* prepared in heaven.‡ Of courſe, the main thing promiſed to Abraham and to his ſpiritual ſeed, in the grant of Canaan, was heaven. And as God was then promiſing heaven to the righteous, by types and ſhadows, ſo it was neceſſary that the land of Canaan ſhould have been called an

* Heb. x. 1. † See Heb. iv. 2. ‡ Heb. iii. 15, 18.

an everlaſting poſſeſſion. Had it not been thus called, God could not have promiſed endleſs life by ſhadows; but muſt have promiſed it openly, without the *vail* or covering. Which was contrary to his deſign at that time. Theſe things make it clear, that *everlaſting* was uſed in a two-fold ſenſe among the Jews. The type or the ſhadow, ſeperately conſidered, was never to ceaſe, was perpetual, during their diſpenſation and no longer; but the ſubſtance contained in this ſhadow was ſtrictly everlaſting. And this ſubſtance was the grand thing intended, in the everlaſting covenant. What places this matter beyond diſpute, the Jews certainly received all their everlaſting grants, promiſes, ſtatutes and ordinances, in the unlimited ſenſe, as they related to things of the inviſible world. They certainly underſtood the dominion and kingdom of the Meſſiah to be *forever and ever*. And this they underſtood from the words of the covenant; or from *everlaſting* itſelf, as has been ſhown. Alſo, the uſe of their *ſhadows*, they knew, at leaſt ſome of them, was reſtricted to *their generations*,—to the coming of the Meſſiah.

As was obſerved above, AIOONIOS, *everlaſting*, is uſed in the Septuagint, in eighty-eight inſtances. Four of which are *figurative*, forty-eight *typical*, and the remaining thirty-ſix in the endleſs ſenſe. It is now evident that theſe two laſt numbers may be added together. For all theſe typical inſtances have an unlimited, as well as a limited meaning. Indeed, the unlimited meaning is the main thing, the ſum of what is intended by them. So that all theſe typical caſes, as each of them decidedly conveys the idea of endleſs duration, may properly, and even neceſſarily muſt, be ſet down in the claſs of unlimited terms. Which leaves but four out of this number, eighty-eight, that are uſed only in the figurative or limited ſenſe.

The whole matter is reduced to this: The inſtances of AIOON (forever), added to thoſe of AIOONIOS (everlaſting), make up in the whole three hundred and ſixty-five inſtances of their uſe, in the Septuagint or old teſtament. Twenty-three only of this number are *figurative;* conſequently all the reſt, three hundred and forty-two, are uſed in the endleſs ſenſe. And theſe figurative caſes give decided evidence, that the proper uſe of *forever* and *everlaſting* is to expreſs duration without end. If otherwiſe, there is then, as we have ſeen, an end to the uſe of tropes and figures. The final conſequence is, every inſtance of the uſe of theſe words, throughout the old teſtament, determines their natural and direct ſenſe to be expreſſive of endleſs duration.

Where now is the boaſted parade of Univerſaliſts? Mr. Winchester and others agree with Dr. Chauncy, in aſſerting that theſe words,

words, in the ſacred writings, are *moſt frequently* and *almoſt perpetually* uſed in the limited ſenſe.* Mr. Whiſton, after ſetting down a number of texts, ſays, 'There is no end of citing 'more *ordinances*, or *ſtatutes*, which were to be *eternal*, or *everlaſting*.——; 'Which yet were to laſt no longer, at the moſt, 'than the Moſaic œconomy.'† Dr. Chauncy ſays, 'I am weary of citing particularly any more texts.'‡ Well he might be *weary*, for all he had cited, to ſhow that theſe words have a limited meaning, were nothing to his purpoſe.

But, the object is to detect the miſtake of Univerſaliſts; and not to ſettle the meaning of theſe words, by ſhowing that they are more often found, in the bible, in the unlimited, than in the limited ſenſe. It is wholly immaterial how often they be found, either in the figurative or in their natural uſe. One ſingle inſtance of any unlimited term, uſed in its direct courſe, is ſufficient to decide its natural import, as may yet more fully appear.

We now come to the new teſtament. And here the promiſes of life are made *openly*, inſtead of being made behind the *curtain*. The great work of bringing *immortality to light*, being reſerved for Chriſt, earthly and heavenly things are of courſe kept diſtinct; the ſubſtance wholly diveſted of the ſhadow.

In the new teſtament, it is remarkable that AIΩΝ, when applied to this world, this ſtate of exiſtence, or the Jewiſh ſtate; or when taken in a limited ſenſe; it is always uſed without the prepoſition EIS. In this way, it is here found thirty-three times.§ But when it is uſed in the endleſs ſenſe, or applied to things of the next world, it is always, excepting eleven inſtances, governed by the prepoſition EIS; as EIS TON AIOONA; in which conſtruction it occurs ſixty times.‖ And theſe eleven exceptions are eaſily explained. In ſix of them it may be taken either in the temporary or endleſs ſenſe.¶ In two, it is uſed as an adjective, and

* P. 267. Salvation all Men. † As quoted by Dr. C. p. 266. ‡ Ibid.

§ The places are, Matt. xii. 32. xiii. 22, 39, 40, 49. xxiv. 3. xxviii. 20. Mark iv. 19. Luke i. 70. xvi. 8. xx. 34. 35. Acts iii. 21. Rom. xii. 2. 1 Cor. i. 20. ii. 6, twice, 7, 8. iii. 18. x. 11. 2 Cor. iv. 4. Gal. i. 4 Eph. i. 21. ii. 2. vi. 12. 1 Tim. vi. 17. 2 Tim. iv. 10. Tit. ii. 12. Heb. i. 2. ix. 26. xi. 3. Thus theſe texts are enumerated by Dr. Edwards. To theſe may be added, Heb. vi. 5.

‖ The places are, Matt. vi. 13. xxi. 19 Mark xi. 14. Luke i. 33, 55. John iv. 14. vi. 51, 58. viii. 35, twice, 51, 52 x. 28. xi. 26. xii. 34. xiii. 8. xiv. 16. Rom. i. 25. ix. 5. xi. 36. xvi. 27. 1 Cor viii. 13. 2 Cor. ix. 9. xi. 31. Gal. i. 5. Phil. iv. 20. 1 Tim i. 17. 2 Tim. iv. 18 Heb. i. 8. v. 6. vi. 20. vii. 17, 21, 24, 28. xiii. 8, 21. 1 Pet. i. 23, 25. iv. 11. v. 11. 1 John ii. 17. 2 John 2. Rev. i. 6, 18. iv. 9, 10. v. 13, 14. vii. 12. x. 6 xi. 15. xv. 7. xxii. 5.—The ſix inſtances in which it is applied to future puniſhment are, Mark iii. 29. 2 Pet. ii. 17. Jud. 13. Rev. xiv. 11, xix. 3. xx. 10.

¶ Mark x. 30. Luke xviii 30. John ix. 32. Eph. ii. 7. iii. 9. Col. i. 26.

and applied to the divine Being, or to his attributes.* In one, the literal meaning is, *from eternity*.† In two, it literally means, throughout every day or period *of eternity*.‡ This gives the uſe of AIOON in every inſtance, throughout the new teſtament; that is, reckoning the reduplications, as, in Engliſh *forever and ever*, to be but ſingle inſtances.

Now, the object is not to ſhow that this Greek word originally intends endleſs duration, becauſe it is more often, than otherwiſe, uſed for this purpoſe, in the new teſtament. But the reaſons why it means an abſolute eternity, when applied to things of the next world, and when governed by the above prepoſition, are the following.

1. It appears neceſſary that AIOON ſhould be applied to this world, or to the preſent ſtate of things, to convince the Greeks that their *AIOON* or *world*, which they thought would never end, was only for a limited term. And, in this caſe it is always found in a different conſtruction, from what it uſually is when joined to things of the coming world. When joined to things of the coming world, it is always, with few exceptions which are eaſily explaind, uſed in the moſt direct and natural conſtruction for to expreſs an abſolute eternity: EIS TON AIOONA, *to eternity*, being the moſt common and pertinent expreſſion for this purpoſe, among the Greeks. In the new teſtament, therefore, the things of time are kept diſtinct from the things of eternity. Which determins the infinitely wide difference between theſe two ſubjects.

2. AIOON, governed by the prepoſition EIS, is the only phraſe excepting one or two, and excepting one or two inſtances,§ in the new teſtament, to expreſs *forever*. And this phraſe, in this part of ſcripture, appears to be uniformly applied to things of the coming world, except the follwing inſtances. Chriſt ſaid to the barren figtree, Matt. xxi. 19, 'Let no fruit grow on thee 'henceforward *forever*;' and Mark xi. 14, 'No man eat fruit 'of thee hereafter *forever*.' John viii. 35. 'The ſervant abid-'eth not in the houſe *forever*; but the Son abideth ever.' In each of theſe texts, nothing can be plainer than that EIS TON AIOONA, or *forever*, by its own power, expreſſes endleſs duration. And theſe inſtances alone are ſufficient to determine the original ſenſe of this phraſe. Its power or meaning is here ſo ſtriking we cannot but ſee it. But in all the other inſtances in the new teſtament, *forever*, as appers, is applied to things of the

* Eph. iii. 11. 1 Tim. i. 17. † Acts xv. 18. ‡ Eph. iii. 21. 2 Pet. iii. 18.
§ 2 Pet. iii. 18. AUTO HE DOXA KAI NUN KAI EIS HEMERAN AIOONOS, literally, throughout every day of eternity.

the future world. Divine wiſdom, therefore, has choſen this phraſe, to be appropriated to things of that world; a few inſtances excepted, which, at the ſame time, compel us to take it in the unlimited ſenſe.

3. In the new teſtament, the ſame as in the old, EIS TON AIOONA is ſeveral times uſed as a poſitive denial, and is tranſlated, *never*. John iv. 14. 'Whoſoever drinketh of the water 'that I ſhall give him ſhall *never* thirſt.' viii. 51. 'Verily, ver-'ily, I ſay unto you, if a man keep my ſaying, he ſhall *never* ſee 'death.' x. 27, 28. 'My ſheep hear my voice,——: And I give 'unto them eternal life; and they ſhall *never* periſh, neither ſhall 'any man pluck them out of my hand.' xi. 26. 'Whoſoever 'liveth and believeth in me ſhall *never* die. xiii. 8. 'Peter ſaith 'unto him (Jeſus), Thou ſhalt *never* waſh my feet.' Theſe texts might as well be tranſlated, 'Whoſoever drinketh of the water 'that I ſhall give him ſhall not thirſt *forever*'—ſhall *forever* be kept from thirſting. 'If a man keep my ſaying, he ſhall *for-'ever* be kept from death.' &c. So this term is uſed in the above 'texts,' Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward *forever*.' This phraſe, therefore, in ſuch like connection has the ſame power and meanining as *never*; which perfectly agrees with the original Greek.

An abſolute denial of this ſort as ſtrongly expreſſes an abſolute eternity as can be done by words. 'If a man keep my ſay-'ing he ſhall *never* ſee death,'—ſhall never be hurt of the ſecond death. 'Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward *forever*.' Experience and common ſenſe are here called to witneſs, whether words can be more expreſſive of boundleſs duration. And whether this ſingle term, *never* or *forever* by its own, force or meaning, is not expreſſive of ſuch duration. If therefore, by its own power and direct meaning, it intends endleſs duration, this is its literal meaning. For the power and direct meaning of a word is its literal meaning. Therefore theſe few inſtances of *never* or *forever* are ſufficient to determine its literal meaning. The literal ſenſe of words, or when taken in their natural courſe and by their own direct power, is uniformly the ſame. Were it not ſo, words could give no certain ideas. Conſequently, theſe few inſtances of the uſe of this word, in this unlimited ſenſe, determine this to be its ſtrict ſenſe, as well as a thouſand could.

4. In our Saviour's form of prayer, among others we have this expreſſion, 'For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and 'the glory, *forever*. Amen.' Here, the Greek words, anſwering to *forever*, are EIS TOUS AIOONAS, in the plural number.

ber. Why they are ſo, will hereafter be ſhown, and that they are the ſame, whether ſingular or plural, merely as to duration. Now, in this form of prayer, and moſt ſolemn adoration of God, Chriſt has choſen the term *forever*, or the original words anſwering to it. Hence, we are certain that this is a moſt forcible expreſſion of boundleſs duration. Had there been any one more ſo, in the Greek language, Chriſt would have choſen *that* one, inſtead of *this*. For it is certain he would, in this place eſpecially, deſcribe God, as poſſeſſing *the kingdom*, and *the power*, and *the glory*, to an abſolute eternity. And that it is the duty, and the ſervice, and the joy of his people, to aſcribe theſe attributes to him, *forever*, or without end.

So, it is certain that all the Chriſtian doxologies are as ſtrongly expreſſive of unlimited duration as can be by words. Thus, in Rev. v. 13. 'Bleſſing, and honour, and glory, and power, be 'unto him that ſitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb *forever* 'and ever.' The term being doubled, or *forever and ever*, makes no difference, as to duration only; this will be ſhown in anſwering objections. But theſe aſcriptions of praiſe to God and the Lamb are uſed by the whole church, whether in heaven or on earth. So they will be uſed by all the hoſts of heaven, to a ſtrict eternity. From which it is moſt clear and concluſive, that *forever* is as pertinent and forcible to expreſs a ſtrict eternity as any term whatever.

5. In the new teſtament, AIOON is ſix times applied to the puniſhment of the damned.* In each of theſe inſtances it is governed by the prepoſition EIS; that is, being in its moſt direct and natural conſtruction, to expreſs a ſtate that never has an end. In one of theſe caſes, it makes a poſitive denial: 'He that ſhall 'blaſpheme againſt the Holy Ghoſt hath *never* forgiveneſs, but is 'in danger of eternal damnation.' Dr. Chauncy allows that this muſt be taken literally, as we have ſeen; or that this blaſphemer never is forgiven. And it is impoſſible for him to deny it. To be conſiſtent, he muſt alſo allow that thoſe, who are 'tormented 'day and night *forever and ever*,' are indeed *never* delivered from their torment. So, if he allows one, he muſt, to be conſiſtent, allow all theſe inſtances, that are applied to the puniſhment of the damned. For all of them are of the ſame import, in the original Greek.

We now come to the adjective AIOONIOS, *eternal* or *everlaſting*, as it occurs in the new teſtament. Concerning this uſe of it, Dr. Edwards ſays, 'The adjective AIOONIOS is ſtill 'more unfavourable to Dr. Chauncy's ſyſtem, than the ſubſtantive AIOON. It is found in ſeventy-one places in the whole

* The places are, Mark iii. 29. 2 Pet. ii. 17. Jude 13. Rev. xiv. 11. xix. 3. xx. 10.

'new teſtament; ſixty-ſix, beſide the five in which Dr. Chaun-
'cy allows it is applied to future puniſhment.* In every one
'of the ſixty-ſix inſtances, except two, 2 Tim. i. 9; and Tit. i.
'2; it may, to ſay the leaſt, be underſtood in the endleſs ſenſe.
'If beſide the two inſtances juſt mentioned; Rom. xvi. 25. Phi-
'lem. 15. Heb. vi. 2; and Jude 7, ſhould be pleaded, which,
'I think, are all that any univerſaliſt will pretend do contain a
'limited ſenſe; it may be obſerved concerning Rom. xvi. 25.
'that MUSTEERIOU CHRONOIS AIOONIOIS SESI-
'GEEMENOU may, with at leaſt as great truth and propriety,
'be rendered "myſtery kept ſecret during the eternal or unlim-
"ited paſt ages, or from eternity," as "myſtery kept ſecret ſince
"the world began."—The literal conſtruction of Philem. 15, 16.
'is "That thou mighteſt receive him eternal, no longer as a ſerv-
"ant, but above a ſervant, a brother;" or more briefly thus
"That thou mighteſt receive him as an eternal brother." That O-
'neſimus was, in the endleſs ſenſe, become an eternal brother to
'Philemon, and that as ſuch he ought to be received by Philemon,
'cannot be diſputed, provided they both were, as the apoſtle ſup-
'poſed them to be, real Chriſtians.—The final judgment intended
'in Heb. vi. 2, may with the ſame propriety be called an *endleſs*
'judgment, becauſe it refers to an endleſs duration to follow; as
'it may be called the judgment *of an age* or *diſpenſation*, be-
'cauſe it refers to an age or diſpenſation which ſhall then have
'been paſt.—As to the fire ſuffered by the Sodomites, if the text
'mean the fire of hell, then Jude 7, is to be added to the five
'texts, in which it is acknowledged AIOONIOS refers to fu-
'ture puniſhment. If it mean the fire in which they and their
'city were conſumed in this world, it can be called *eternal*, or
'AIOONIOS, with reſpect to the effect only: and to ſay that
'this effect is to laſt for a limited time only, is the ſame as to ſay,
'that the Sodomites are finally to be ſaved; which is to beg the
'grand queſtion.'†

This ſtatement expoſes the abſurdity of Dr. Chauncy's ſcheme. The original ſenſe of a word, however, is not determined by the frequency of its uſe. Or, becauſe a word is more often uſed in the

* The places are. Matt. xix. 16, 29. xxv. 46. Mark x. 17, 30. Luke x. 25. xvi. 9. xviii. 18, 30. John iii. 15, 16, 36. iv. 14 36. v. 24, 39. vi. 27, 40, 47, 54, 68. x. 28. xii. 25, 50. xvii. 2, 3. Acts xiii. 46, 48. Rom. ii. 7. v 21 vi. 22, 23. xvi. 25, 26. 2 Cor. iv. 17, 18. v. 1. Gal. 6. 8. 2 Theſſ. ii. 16. 1 Tim. i. 16. vi. 12, 16, 19. 2 Tim. i. 9. ii. 10. Tit. i. 2. twice. iii. 7. Philem. 15. Heb. v 9 vi. 2. ix. 12, 14, 15 xiii. 20. 1 Pet. v. 10. 2 Pet. i. 11. 1 John i. 2. ii. 25. iii. 15. v. 11, 13, 20. Jude 7, 21. Rev. xiv. 6.——The five texts in which Dr. Chauncy allows AIOONIOS to be applied to future puniſhment are Matt. xviii. 8. xxv. 41, 46. Mark iii. 29. 2 Theſſ. i. 9. To which is to be added, Jude 7.

† *Edwards againſt Chauncy*, p. 252, 253.

the unlimited, than in the limited ſenſe, this does not decide its original meaning, and that it muſt be taken in the unlimited ſenſe. A word, by the help of other words, may give an unlimited idea; then again, in a different connection, the ſame word may give a limited idea. The idea given by a word or term, in its direct uſe, or by its own authority or power, determines the original or literal meaning of ſaid word or term. Hence, the reaſons why this word, AIOONIOS, *eternal* or *everlaſting*, in the new teſtament, intends ſtrictly *eternal*, are theſe,

1. One main part of Chriſt's work was to reveal and ſettle the things of eternity. Accordingly, Chriſt and the apoſtles give us an account of theſe things in the moſt plain and literal manner. Whenever they ſpeak of theſe things, or of their duration, it is without types and without figures—uſing words in their literal ſenſe. For this purpoſe, they almoſt univerſally make uſe of this *adjective* or its *ſubſtantive*. *Forever*, *eternal*, or words of the ſame import, from the ſame original, are the common words; and uſed, perhaps, an hundred fold more in the new teſtament, than all others; for to expreſs the duration of *unſeen things*. Now, when endleſs duration, or eternity itſelf and the things of it, is the grand ſubject, the common words employed about it, are to be conſidered as the moſt pertinent, or certainly as much ſo as any. Eſpecially when this ſubject is treated in ſuch an open and literal manner. And whereas this *adjective*, *eternal*, or *everlaſting*, is ſo univerſally uſed, in the new teſtament, to deſcribe the things of the next world, this keeps up a diſtinction between temporal and eternal things; ſhowing their wide difference, and obliging us to take them in their ſtrict meaning.

2. Fifty-one of the forementioned ſixty-ſix inſtances of the uſe of this *adjective* are applied to the future life and happineſs of the righteous. As, 'My ſheep hear my voice—: And I give 'unto them *eternal* life'—'He that hateth his life in this world 'ſhall keep it unto life *eternal*'—'He that believeth on the Son 'hath *everlaſting* life'—'The gift of God is *eternal* life through 'Jeſus Chriſt our Lord,' &c. &c.—It is certain that 'eternal 'life' here, by its own authority and direct ſenſe, intends endleſs life. For, by all ſuch expreſſions the goſpel of ſalvation is preached, and therefore endleſs life promiſed. It is alſo certain, from many conſiderations, that Chriſt here enſures the endleſs life of the righteous, in undeniable terms. Therefore, AIOONIOS or eternal is as pertinent for this purpoſe, to ſay the leaſt, as any other term.

8. Several

3. Several of the forementioned inſtances are applied to the divine character; as Rom. i. 20. xvi. 25, 26. 'The inviſible 'things of him from the creation of the world are clearly ſeen, 'being underſtood by the things that are made, even his *eternal* 'power and Godhead'—'According to the commandment of the '*everlaſting* God'—'According to the revelation of the myſte-'ry; which was kept ſecret ſince the world began, or kept ſe-'cret from the *eternal* paſt ages, or from *eternity*.' As the apoſtle is here writing to thoſe who hold, or have held, that their gods come into being in time, or have a beginning; ſo he undoubtedly means to eſtabliſh the ſtrict eternity of God, as having neither beginning of days nor end of life. But, if he does not give this character of God, in theſe texts, neither does he in this epiſtle; nor is it ſo given in the new teſtament, if it is not in the above texts. Though he, in another place of this epiſtle, ſtiles him, 'The uncorruptible God; yet a being that has a beginning may be *uncorruptible* or *immortal*. Hence, it is undeniable that the word *eternal*, is as pertinent as any word can be, to expreſs the ſtrict eternity of God; becauſe, it is undeniably evident that the apoſtle here intends by it, to give God this character. So in all other places of ſcripture, when applied to the divine being, it is intended for the ſame purpoſe.

4. Two or more of the above inſtances are placed in oppoſition to periſhable and temporal things. John vi. 27. 'Labour 'not for the meat which periſheth, but for the meat which en-'dureth unto *everlaſting* life.' It is by this ſimple word, *everlaſting*, and nothing elſe, that the duration of this *life* is here expreſſed. There is no other word uſed with it, for this purpoſe; neither can the nature of the ſubject, to which it is joined, give it its meaning; but this word alone expreſſes the nature of the ſubject, or duration of this life. Theſe things are ſelf-evident. And, as this *life* is placed in oppoſition to that *which periſheth*, ſo this life muſt be endleſs life. It cannot be any thing ſhort of this. A life that ever comes to an end, makes no oppoſition or difference to that which periſheth, but is the ſame thing. This gives the literal ſenſe of *everlaſting*. By its own authority it expreſſes endleſs duration, or, joined with *life*, endleſs life; and cannot be taken otherwiſe. Therefore, when joined with *death*, and uſed literally, it expreſſes endleſs death; for the literal ſenſe of a word is the ſame in all caſes.

Again, 2 Cor. iv. 18. 'The things which are ſeen 'are tem-'poral; but the things which are not ſeen are eternal.' As this was conſidered in the laſt Letter, it is only to add; that, in this

and

and the text juſt cited, *unſeen things*, becauſe they are not *temporal*, nor do they *periſh* or come to naught, are of courſe declared and decided to be things whoſe duration never has an end. And they are ſo decided wholly by the force of theſe words, *eternal* and *everlaſting*. Theſe words therefore, if literally uſed, can intend no other than ſuch duration; neither can words be more pertinent for this purpoſe.

5. The word *endleſs*, as *endleſs* happineſs or *endleſs* miſery, appears lately to have come into uſe, or to be more in uſe, in conſequence of the diſpute with univerſaliſts: and is thought to be more pertinent, for to expreſs a ſtrict eternity of happineſs or miſery, than any other word; or certainly more ſo than the words we are now explaining: allowing this to be the caſe, at the preſent time, for words muſt be taken as they are underſtood; ſtill the caſe was not originally ſo. This is evident from what we have juſt ſeen. 'The things which are not ſeen,' that 'are 'eternal,' placed in oppoſition to 'things temporal,' plainly deny that the former have an end; and as ſtrongly deny this as words can. 'Everlaſting life,' ſet over againſt 'the meat which per-'iſheth,' as ſtrongly as words can, declares that the former never will periſh, ſo never will have an end. Beſides, theſe words could not be thus uſed, unleſs they literally import a ſtrict eternity of duration. *Eternal* could not be ſet in oppoſition to *temporal*, ſo as to deny that unſeen things are temporal, unleſs *eternal* intends the ſame as *endleſs*. Neither could *everlaſting*, or everlaſting life, be oppoſed to things which periſh; unleſs *everlaſting*, joined with life, poſitively ſays that this life ſhall not periſh. And this is terming of it endleſs life, as correctly as can be done.

So the ſubſtantive AIOON, *forever*, or *never* (with a negative particle), is originally and literally as pertinent, as is poſſible for a word to be.—'He that doeth theſe things ſhall *never* be 'moved,' or *caſt away*.'*—'The LORD ſhall *never* ſuffer the 'righteous to be moved.'†—'My ſheep hear my voice—: And 'I give unto them eternal life; and they ſhall *never* periſh.'—'If a man keep my ſaying, he ſhall never ſee death.'‡—'Let no 'fruit grow on thee henceforward *forever*.'§—What words can be more pertinent?

Furthermore, theſe words have one advantage above all others. —'the *eternity* of Iſrael (as it might be rendered) will not lie, 'nor repent:'‖—'The high and lofty One that inhabiteth *eter-'nity*:'¶—'The *eternal* God:'**—'The *everlaſting* God:'††

Theſe

* Pſal. xv. 5, and lv. 22. † John x. 28, and viii. 51. § Matt. xxi. 19.
‖ 1 Sam. xv. 29. ¶ Iſai. xlvii. 15. ** Deut. xxxiii. 27. †† Rom. xvi. 29.

Theſe declare God to have neither beginning nor end of life. Whereas, the word *endleſs* may be applied to a being that had a beginning.

6. As to the forementioned five inſtances of AIOONIOS, in the new teſtament, applied to future puniſhment; as, 'Depart 'from me ye curſed into *everlaſting* fire'—'Theſe ſhall go away 'into *everlaſting* puniſhment,'* &c. &c; if theſe are to be taken literally, as may yet more fully appear, they muſt, they of courſe make certain this moſt awful event, the endleſs miſery of the damned.

V. The ſenſe of the original Hebrew next comes under examination. But what we have ſeen from the Septuagint very much ſupercedes the neceſſity of this. Something on this head, however, appears expedient. As,

1. The principal word in this caſe is OLAM. There are other Hebrew words, which are ſometimes rendered the ſame as this is, into our language. But OLAM is uſed, in the original of the old teſtament, more than all the reſt, to expreſs unlimited duration. The literal ſenſe of this word is *eternity*; and joined with a prepoſition, as it generally is, it means *to eternity*. Dr. Strong ſays, 'It is known that one meaning of this word '(OLAM) is *hidden* or *obſcured*; and I have no doubt but 'this was its original meaning, as all words were firſt applied to 'ſenſible objects. Some have from this inſinuated, that when 'applied to duration the word only means, there is a total uncer-'tainty how long it will laſt; but there is no ground to ſuppoſe 'the inſinuation a juſt one. A finite mind cannot comprehend 'infinite; ſo that infinite or eternal duration, is in its nature hid-'den or incomprehenſible by men. But no limited duration, 'be it ever ſo long, is in its nature incomprehenſible or hidden. 'A limited duration may be hidden from us, becauſe depending 'on the ſecret will of God; but is not hidden or incomprehen-'ſible to men in its own nature, as is the caſe with endleſs du-'ration. The original application of this word to duration, in 'the Hebrew language, was doubtleſs on the ground I have 'mentioned; and its natural meaning is duration in its nature 'incomprehenſible; and none but endleſs or eternal duration is 'ſuch.'†

The other Hebrew words, ſometimes tranſlated *forever*, appear to ſerve the place of adverbs, or as adverbs do in our language. Which words are. OD, *perpetuity*, or *continually*; BEL, *all*, or *always*; and NOSETH, *the end*, or *in* or *at the end*, or *finally*. When theſe words are applied to duration, and in their literal ſenſe, they decidedly expreſs that duration which has

* Matt. xxv. 41, 46. † *Benevolence and Miſery*, p. 100.

has no limits. But OLAM is uſed directly to expreſs *eternity* itſelf.

Again, OLAM is uſed as an adjective as well as a ſubſtantive. Gen. xxi. 33. 'Abraham called on the name of the LORD, the '*everlaſting* God;' literally, the *Eternity*-God. Pſal. cxix. 142. 'Thy righteouſneſs is an *everlaſting* righteouſneſs,' an *eternity*-righteouſneſs. Which expreſſions give the ſtrongeſt idea of boundleſs duration. Again, Pſal. cxii. 6. 'The right-'eous ſhall be in everlaſting remembrance,' in *eternity*-remembrance, is the literal ſenſe of the original. As this *remembrance* is placed oppoſite to 'the deſire of the wicked which ſhall per-'iſh,' as in verſe 10. following; ſo it is here made certain, that this *remembrance* never will periſh, or have an end: which alſo gives the literal ſenſe of *everlaſting*, or of the *original* word. But,

2. The ſame remarks hold relative to OLAM, which have been made on the above remarkable inſtances out of the Septuagint. Thus, OLAM is uſed in Deut. xxxii. 40. Where the great JEHOVAH moſt ſolemnly ſwears that he lives *forever*; or that he lives in OLAM, inhabits *eternity*. OLAM is uſed throughout the hundred and thirty-ſixth Pſalm, ſo in all the oth-er inſtances which declare that 'the mercy of the LORD endur-'eth *forever*.' OLAM is made a poſitive denial, in each of the above-cited inſtances of this kind, out of the old teſtament. As, 'He that doth theſe things ſhall never be moved,' &c. OLAM is generally uſed, either as a ſubſtantive or adjective, to expreſs the duration of the promiſes to the righteous, of their fu-ture happineſs and glory. Now, in all theſe inſtances of the uſe of this Hebrew word, it is certain that no other could be more expreſſive of an abſolute eternity. Had there been others more ſo, why did not the omniſcient Being, who can chooſe the beſt words, uſe *them*, inſtead of *this*? Or, has he revealed his own *eternity*, in his holy *word*, or has he not? Has he revealed an eternal paradiſe, prepared for the righteous, or has he not?

3. This Hebrew word, joined with a prepoſition, as LEOLAM is rendered into Greek by the tranſlators, with that conſtruction of AIOON which moſt directly expreſſes unceaſing duration. Or LEOLAM, uſed as a ſubſtantive, is in almoſt every inſtance of the Greek verſion of the old teſtament, rendered EIS TON AIOONA, *to eternity*. This appears, by comparing the He-brew texts with thoſe inſtances of the uſe of EIS TON AIOONA, as above noted from the Greek verſion. Accordingly we have the authority of that learned and venerable body of ſcribes and

prieſts,

prieſts, the authors of the Greek tranſlation. Not only ſo, Chriſt and the apoſtles, when they make quotations from the old teſtament, render this Hebrew word into Greek, in the ſame manner. This is ſeen by comparing the original copies; as Pſal. xlv. 6, with Luke i. 33, 55, and Heb. i. 8; and 1 Pet. i. 23, 25, with Pſal. cxxxvi; and ſeveral other places.

4. This Hebrew word is frequently applied to the future puniſhment of the wicked. Pſal. ix. 5. 'Thou haſt rebuked the 'heathen, thou haſt deſtroyed the wicked, thou haſt put out their 'name *forever and ever.*' Directly after, the ſame word is applied to the duration of God himſelf. 'But thou, LORD, ſhalt en-'dure *forever:* he hath prepared his throne for judgment.' This deſtruction, therefore, ſhall not come to an end while God lives, and while he lives, he lives to judge and puniſh the wicked. So one reaſon why God ſwears that he lives *forever*, as we have ſeen above, is, as he himſelf directly ſays, 'I will render 'vengeance to mine enemies, and will reward them that hate me.' Becauſe he lives *forever*, the full reward of their deeds will of courſe be meaſured out to them. Beſides this deſtruction to *the wicked*, and this their *name put out forever and ever*, is explained in the new teſtament, to have their names *blotted out of the book of life*, and they *tormented day and night, forever and ever.*

In Iſai. xxxiv 9, 10, we have another remarkable inſtance of the uſe of this word, applied to the ſame end. 'The ſtreams 'thereof ſhall be turned into pitch, and the duſt thereof into brim-'ſtone, and the land thereof ſhall become burning pitch. It ſhall 'not be *quenched* night nor day; the *ſmoke* thereof ſhall go up '*forever:* from generation to generation it ſhall lie waſte; none 'ſhall paſs through it *forever and ever.*' Concerning this moſt awful deſtruction, from the LORD, upon Idumea and the people of his curſe, the main thing is to deſcribe the puniſhment of the damned in hell. The ſame thing is brought into view, Rev. xiv 11. 'And they ſhall be tormented with fire and brimſtone; 'and the *ſmoke* of their torment aſcendeth up *forever and ever;* 'and they have no reſt day nor night.' And, Mark ix. 43, 44, —'Into the fire that *never* ſhall be *quenched;* where their worm 'dieth not, and the fire is not *quenched.*' So, in the anſwer Abraham gives to the requeſt of the rich man in hell, the laſt part of which is, 'Beſide all this, between us and you there is a great 'gulph fixed: ſo that they which would paſs from hence to you 'cannot; neither can they paſs to us, that would come from 'thence.' Even a father cannot *paſs* from heaven to hell, to grant

grant relief to a dear child or ſon. Which agrees with the above words from Iſaiah, 'None ſhall paſs through it forever and ever.' It is therefore clear, that the main thing intended by this moſt awful doom upon Idumea, is to ſet forth the puniſhment of the damned. And the ſame Hebrew word is here uſed to expreſs the duration of their puniſhment, as is uſed to expreſs the duration of God himſelf.

Again, Job xx. 6, 7. 'Though his (the wicked man's) excellency mount up to the heavens, and his head reach unto the clouds; yet he ſhall periſh forever like his own dung.' Pſal. lii. 4, 5. 'Thou loveſt all devouring words; O thou deceitful tongue. God ſhall likewiſe deſtroy thee forever.' And, xcii. 7. 'When the wicked ſpring as the graſs, and when all the workers of iniquity do flouriſh; it is that they ſhall be deſtroyed forever.' The original word, anſwering to *forever*, in theſe two firſt texts, is NOSHETH; in the laſt it is OD. But theſe words, when applied directly to duration, and in their ſtrict ſenſe, are clearly expreſſive of that which is unlimited. This may be ſeen by examining the texts, as noted below,* where theſe words are found in the original.

There is no need of citing all the texts out of the old teſtament, which expreſs the unceaſing miſery of the damned, as this point is ſo accurately ſettled in the new. It remains only to add, when future puniſhment is expreſſed by every Hebrew word that is uſed in the unlimited ſenſe, as is found to be the caſe; this ſerves to confirm, and make certain, what is the awful doom that awaits the ungodly, except they repent. And ought to warn us of this ſolemn truth: 'He, that being often reproved, hardeneth his neck, ſhall ſuddenly be deſtroyed, and that without remedy.'

I am &c.

* Job xxiii. 7. Pſal. xvi. 11. xliv. 23. xlix. 9. lxviii. 16. lxxiv. 1, 10, 19. lxxvii. 8. In theſe, the word is NOSHETH. In the following it is OD; Pſal. ix. 18. xix. 9. xxi. 6. xxii. 26. lix. 9. lxi. 8. lxxvii. 7. lxxxiii. 17. lxxxix. 29. xcii. 7. cxi. 3, 10. cxii. 3, 9.——In Iſai. xxxiii. 20. the word BEL anſwers to *forever*, or not *ever*. OD appears to be a helping word to OLAM, and generally joined with it in the inſtances of *forever and ever*; and might, perhaps, be rendered *forever, even forever*.

LETTER III.

Objections to the foregoing, conſidered.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

OUR attention is now called to the following objections.

I. Dr. Chauncy ſays, 'Theſe words, AIOON and 'AIOONIOS, are evidently more *looſe* and *general* in their 'meaning, than the Engliſh words *eternity*, *everlaſting*, by 'which they are commonly rendered in our bibles. If it were 'not ſo, how comes it to paſs, that AIOON and AIOONIOS 'will not always bear being tranſlated *eternity*, *everlaſting* ?'* To anſwer this, Dr Edwards ſays, 'By the ſame argument it may 'be proved, that the words *eternity* and *everlaſting*, in our lan-'guage, are more looſe and general in their meaning, than the 'Greek AIOON and AIOONIOS. We frequently ſay, ſuch a 'man is an everlaſting talker, or he talks eternally; he is eternally 'ſlandering and quarrelling with his neighbours. But according 'to Dr. C's ſenſe of the Greek words AIOON and AIOONIOS, 'the Engliſh phraſes juſt mentioned cannot be properly tranſlat-'ed, by the uſe of thoſe Greek words. The Doctor ſays they 'properly mean the duration of an age. But when it is ſaid, a 'man talks eternally, the meaning is not that he talks for an age. '—The truth is, there are idioms in all languages, which will not 'bear a literal tranſlation into any other language.'†

But Dr. Chauncy goes on, to prove that theſe Greek words are more looſe in their meaning, than they are in our Engliſh tranſlation, and urges Matt. xxviii. 20. Luke i. 70. Coloſ. i. 26. Tit. i. 2. For an anſwer to his reaſoning on theſe two laſt paſſages, ſee page 193. As to Matt. xxviii. 20. 'Lo, I am with you al-'way *even unto the end of the world*, EOOS TEES SUN-'TELEIAS TOU AIOONOS;' it has been ſhown that AIOON, uſed without the prepoſition EIS, may be applied, without any ambiguity, to this world, or to the preſent ſtate of exiſtence. And this anſwers the other paſſage, Luke i. 70.—'Holy prophets, 'which have been *ſince the world began*, AP AIOONOS.'

Dr. C. ſays again, 'The particles, ETI and EPEKEINA, 'are ſometimes added in the Sepuagint verſion of the old teſta-'ment, to the word AIOON, to give it the greater emphaſis: 'Whereas, ſhould we add the Engliſh words, anſwerable to thoſe 'Greek particles, to the word *eternity*, it would make evident 'nonſenſe; as any one may readily perceive upon trial. Thus,

'Exod.

* P. 261. † *Edwards againſt Chauncy*, P. 243.

'Exod. xv. 18. *The Lord shall reign*, TON AIOONA, KAI 'EP AIOONA, KAI ETI, *forever and ever and further.* '——Dan. xii. 3. *They shall shine as the stars*, EIS TOUS 'AIOONAS. KAI ETI, *forever and further.*' Mic. iv. 5. '*We will walk in the name of the Lord our God*, EIS TON 'AIOONA, KAI EPEKEINA, *forever and beyond it.*'*

——By the same rule, some of Dr. C's expressions, were they literally translated into Greek, 'would make evident non-'sense.' It is needless to cite any of his expressions, to this end; for in his way of reasoning, the same may be said of all other writings. In an instrument of conveyance of land, words of the same meaning, and additions to these words, are used over and over again. The design in this case, is not to study elegance of speech, but to make the instrument valid, by cutting off all occasion. Experience has taught the propriety as well as necessity of this.

As the Jews held to a future state, so when it is said, 'The 'LORD shall reign EIS TON AIOONA, KAI ETI, *forever* '*and further*;' the meaning is, he shall reign during this world, and further; or during this world and the next. Which is a very significant expression, refering to both worlds, as well as to his endless reign. As this, Exod. xvth, is a song of triumph over Pharaoh and his host, so it refers us to the reign and government of God over Pharaoh, after his death, as well as before and at his death. The revelation of this truth was of great use, at that time, to the Israelites; so to future ages. Likewise Dan. xii. 3. 'They 'shall shine as the stars EIS TOUS AIOONAS, KAI ETI,' was of special import both to Jews and Babylonians. Which was, that after the day of glorious light commences, which Daniel here predicts, the saints, though before despised, should be respected and honoured, during this world and further; during the dispensation before, and the dispensation after the coming of the Messiah, and further; or, which is the same, to eternity. Again, Mic. iv. 5. 'We will walk in the name of the LORD our God 'EIS TON AIOONA, KAI EPEKEINA, forever and beyond 'it,' was an expression of solemn devotedness to God, during this world and the next, or throughout all worlds. And, *throughout all worlds*, by common use, has become a pertinent expression of endless duration.

Dr. Hammond shows the origin of the particles, ETI further, and EPEKEINA beyond; and that they were added to *forever*, or to AIOON, to distinguish the two dispensations or ages, one before and the other after the Messiah, as well as to designate both worlds,

* *Salvation of all Men*, P. 263.

worlds, the preſent and that which is to come. The Doctor ſhows, however, that the Jews uſed AIOON without any addition excepting the prepoſition EIS, and uſed it in the moſt univerſal ſenſe; to include all worlds, all diſpenſations, and all duration. And when they ſometimes made additions to this word, it was to cut off all occaſion; or to fix the point beyond diſpute, that there would be a diſpenſation after theirs, and that there is, beſide the preſent, another and an eternal world. See Hammond's Account on Luke i. 70. The Doctor, in the ſame place, informs that when the Sadducees declared their ſentiments, which was after Ezra's time, that then the Jews ordered an addition made to *forever*, in their *benedictions* and *doxologies*. The reaſon was, the Sadducees held to but one AIOON, but one world or ſtate of exiſtence. They might hold, and moſt probably did, that this world was eternal; yet they denied any exiſtence, as to individuals, after the preſent. Therefore, to deſignate both worlds, and to aſcribe praiſe to God, as being God of this world and the next, the body of the Jews, in oppoſition to the Sadducees, ordered an addition to this word: they adopted this form of ſpeech, AP' AIOONOS EIS TON AIOONA, *from age to age*, or from this world to the next. 'And,' the Doctor ſays, 'though perhaps this latter form be before *Ezra*'s time to be 'met with in the Hebrew writings; yet, it ſeems, 'twas not in 'their forms of benedictions in the public ſervice, and there it 'was probably inſerted on that occaſion. And an abbreviate of 'that form it is which the chriſtians have delivered to them by 'Chriſt, Matt. vi. 13. *thine is the kingdom, the power and 'the glory*, EIS TOUS AIOONAS *to both ages*, (or rather 'to both worlds), the preſent and the future; which we accord-'ing to ſenſe render *forever and ever*, i. e. for this world and for 'the next. This is more largely ſet by the apoſtle, *Gal.* i. 5. 'EIS TOUS AIOONAS TOON AIOONOON, *to the ages 'of ages*; but yet more amply in the ancient church, which 'added that ſecond verſicle to the doxology, *As it was in the 'beginning*, (i. e. AP' AIOONOS, *from the age, from the 'beginning of the world*, as AP' AIOONOS here ſignifies) '*is now, and ever ſhall be, world without end*, i. e. now, in 'this world, and to that world which ſhall never end.' Therefore, the moſt which can be made of *forever* when doubled, or *forever and ever*, alſo when taken with theſe additions, *forever and further, forever and beyond*, is this, they were introduced on intereſting occaſions, and deſigned to aſcertain this and the inviſible world. But will Dr. C. call *forever and*

more

more, or *forevermore* evident nonſenſe? The truth is, *forevermore* became pertinent by common uſe, and expreſſive of endleſs duration, as well as *forever*, or *to eternity*; but not more ſo. The ſame may be ſaid of the original words.

But after all that can be ſaid, on either ſide of the queſtion, it is enough for us to know how theſe expreſſions were originally underſtood. And it is very evident that the Jews meant to deſcribe the reign of Jehovah, which Dr. C. calls 'forever and 'farther,' as in Exod. xv. 18, to be an endleſs reign. But the original word without this additional particle means the ſame, as to duration only. As in the paſſage already conſidered, Exod. xiv. 13, 'The Egyptians whom ye have ſeen to-day, ye ſhall ſee 'them again no more *forever*.' *Further*, therefore, being added, as in the former caſe, and making no difference as to duration, muſt intend ſomething elſe, as we have ſeen. Again, when Chriſt uſed the original word in the plural number, as in Matt. vi. 13, it is plain that he meant to declare the univerſal dominion of God the Father; as extending over this world and the next, and throughout all worlds. Alſo that his kingdom, and power, and glory has no end. Then again, Chriſt often uſed the ſingular, AIOON or *eternity*, with the prepoſition EIS or *to*, as a poſitive denial that ſuch or ſuch an event ſhould ever occur again. Which was uſing it ſtrictly in the endleſs ſenſe, as well as deciding its true meaning. Therefore, when this word is uſed in the *plural*, it gives a complicated idea, refering to all worlds, and to every ſtage of exiſtence; but, as to duration only, it gives one ſimple idea of boundleſs duration. Therefore, whether *ſingular* or *plural*, ſimply as to duration, it gives but one and the ſame idea. It is ſuppoſed, however, the Jews and ancient chriſtians, in their doxologies, and ſometimes on other occaſions, meant, by their duplications and additions, as *forever and ever*, *forevermore*, *forever and for aye*, to ſpeak in the ſtrongeſt and moſt exalted manner; ſo as to cut off all occaſion from heathen, ſadducee, or infidel, as to the duration of God, and the things of eternity.

It is here worthy of ſpecial remark: Had the Jews, all of them, interpreted theſe words, as Dr. C. does every inſtance he cites from the old teſtament; calling them, *from age to age*, *ages of ages*, applying them wholly to this world, or to a temporary duration, in this caſe, there would have been no ground for any diſpute between the Phariſees and Sadducees. The Sadducees took every word of the law of Moſes literally. And denied that their everlaſting promiſes and grants had any relation

to

to unſeen and eternal things. This raiſed a diſpute between them and the Phariſees; who held theſe grants and promiſes, to be promiſes of an endleſs life, in the coming world. And true believers, among them, built their hope of endleſs life upon theſe promiſes, as we have already ſeen. Dr. C, following the example of the Sadducees, virtually denies that theſe everlaſting grants and ordinances promiſed immortal life to believers. Dr. C. applies them all literally; or he aſſerts that they contained nothing, which extended any further than the Jewiſh diſpenſation laſted. See page 264—266, and elſewhere. But the Phariſees evidently held the oppoſite, and that they were promiſes of the reſurrection, and that the ſaints in heaven ſhall *die no more*; as Chriſt ſaid, Luke xxi. 36. The Phariſees agreed with Chriſt as to this doctrine, and they muſt have learned it from the force of *everlaſting* and other like words, as has been ſhown. Hence, the very exiſtence of this diſpute, between the Phariſees and Sadducees, is enough to detect Dr. C's miſtake, concerning the ſenſe of theſe words. But,

II. The main objection univerſaliſts bring againſt the meaning of theſe words, as we have hitherto conſidered it, is, that they are often uſed in a limited ſenſe. After citing, to this end, a great number of paſſages, and tracing the bible through, Dr. C. ſays, 'From this frequent, and almoſt perpetual, uſe of the words 'AIOON and AIOONOS, it is, I think, beyond all reaſonable 'diſpute, evident, that their *proper meaning*, at leaſt, as uſed in 'the ſacred writings, is an *age, œconomy*, or *period of duration*, whether *long* or *ſhort*.'* The Doctor ſays again, 'If we 'will confine ourſelves to the *mere force* of the *word itſelf*, '(AIOONOS or everlaſting), it more probably means a *limited*, than an *endleſs*, duration; and for this very good reaſon, 'becauſe *this* is, by far, the moſt *frequent* uſe of it in the ſacred 'writings.'† And he interprets AIOON in the ſame ſenſe as he does AIOONOS, as to duration. Mr. Wincheſter, as he copies after Dr. C, cites a great number of paſſages, which he thinks muſt be taken in the limited ſenſe only. He then draws this concluſion: 'Now, the rule for underſtanding words is this; 'What *muſt* be the meaning of the word, in *many* places, and 'what *may* be the meaning, in *all*; is the true ſenſe of the ſame.'‡ If this pretended rule have any *meaning*, it muſt be, that, as *everlaſting* and *forever* are, in many places uſed, and moſt frequently uſed in the limited ſenſe, as he ſays; they therefore *may*, and *muſt* be ſo taken in all places of ſcripture. Which is a direct contradiction to his interpretation of the word, *all*, as we ſhall hereafter ſee. This

* P. 267. † P. 269. ‡ P. 18.

This objection, as here ſtated by Dr. C. and Mr. W. cannot be granted, and that it is a groundleſs aſſertion, has perhaps been made evident. If we except figurative expreſſions, as the everlaſting hills, &c. which is obviouſly contrary to the literal ſenſe, and theſe words are not more frequently uſed in a limited than in an unlimited manner. In the old teſtament, as we have ſeen, and as any one may ſee by looking into his bible, they are almoſt univerſally uſed, either in the unlimited ſenſe only, or in a two-fold ſenſe, refering both to the ſhadow and the ſubſtance, and including both time and eternity. In the new teſtament AIOONIOS, everlaſting, is applied directly, without any relation to the type, to deſignate unſeen, endleſs things. And there is no variation from this rule, worth naming, in thoſe numerous inſtances of its uſe. And the phraſe, EIS TON AIOONA, *to eternity*, which is the common one that is applied to inviſible things only, is without any exception, uſed in the unlimited ſenſe.

But admitting Dr. C's and Mr. W's objection, 'and for this 'very good reaſon,' as the Doctor ſays, becauſe theſe words are more frequently uſed in the limited ſenſe, therefore they muſt always be ſo taken, or more probably taken in this manner; 'or cannot, merely by their own force, be taken otherwiſe'; admitting this, and it equally overthrows their own ſcheme. For, in this line of arguing, we can find not one unlimited expreſſion, in the bible.

The word infinite is here uſed three times: in Job xxii. 5. Pſal. cxlvii. 5. Nah. iii. 9. We alſo find it in the marginal reading, in Nah. ii. 9, which makes four inſtances of its uſe, in ſcripture. In but one of theſe inſtances is it applied to the divine being, or to his attribute, *underſtanding;* as Pſal. cxlvii. 5. In all the reſt it is uſed in the finite ſenſe. That is, if we argue as Dr. C. and Mr. W. do, in denying the infinite evil of ſin, that in Job xxii. 5. can mean nothing but finite; and thoſe in Nah. ii. 9, and iii. 9, as they treat of the riches of Nineveh and No, can mean nothing elſe. Therefore, as the word *infinite* is more frequently uſed, in the ſacred volume, in the finite ſenſe, than in the infinite, it does not, merely of its own force, determine the underſtanding of the LORD to be infinite. Or when it is ſaid, as in the above Pſalm, "His underſtanding *is* infinite,' this cannot be taken ſtrictly or literally. It cannot, if we admit the above objection to be true.

The word *unſearchable* is uſed five times.——It is applied to the greatneſs of the LORD, Pſal. cxiv. 3; and Eph. iii. 8, to

the

the riches of Chriſt; therefore, in both of theſe it has its literal meaning. In Job. v. 9, and Rom. xi. 33, it is applied to the things, judgments, and ways of God. The things of God are numberleſs to men, and to men his judgments and ways are paſt finding out. But angels, for ought we know, may number the hoſt of heaven, and even count the duſt of the earth. And angels, in a meaſure, may know all the ways and judgments of God, and ſee their particular end. It is granted that angels and ſaints will forever be learning more of God, by obſerving his ways; yet his ways and works are not, in their own nature, boundleſs or unſearchable. Creation is not coequal with the Creator. The ſource of all things is inexhauſtible, but not the things themſelves. Certainly the things, ways, and judgments of God, are not inexhauſtible and unſearchable, in the ſenſe their Author is. Therefore, in theſe inſtances, *unſearchable* cannot be taken in its moſt literal ſenſe. It cannot be ſo taken in Dr. C's line of reaſoning. Neither can it be taken in its moſt literal meaning, in Prov. xxv. 3, for it is here applied to the heart of kings. So that three times out of five, this word is uſed in ſome reſtrained manner; or certainly not in the moſt ſtrict manner. Which makes it impoſſible to prove the real unſearchable nature of God, by this epithet, unleſs we renounce the Doctor's way of arguing. In his way of arguing *unſearchable* is not *unſearchable:* And *infinite* is not *infinite.* We might go on to ſhow, were there any need of it, how every unlimited word in the bible, which is applied to the divine being, wholly looſes its force, if we follow the Doctor's rule. Which makes it impoſſible for him to prove, by his own maxims, that the God, mentioned in the holy ſcriptures, is the Supreme God. And this overthrows his own ſcheme.

Again, the words Dr. C. and Mr. W. bring to prove the unceaſing happineſs of heaven, and the final ſalvation of all men, wholly loſe their meaning, and fail of anſwering this end, by the force of the above objection. Indeed, if every threatening in the bible, of eternal puniſhment, and every thing which implies it or relates to it, ſhould be eraſed out; they cannot then prove the final ſalvation of even a part of mankind, until they have given up their own rule, or withdrawn the above objection.

The phraſe, *no more*, is uſed as a *negative*, and as a poſitive denial that ſuch a thing or event ſhall ever return again. As in Gen. ix. 15, 'The waters ſhall *no more* become a flood:' Rev. iii. 12, 'He that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he ſhall go *no more* out;' and vii. 16, 'They ſhall

ſhall hunger *no more*.' Another parallel phraſe, as in Rev. vii. 16, 'Neither thirſt *any more*,' and xxi. 4. 'Neither ſhall 'there be *any more* pain.' Both of theſe phraſes, *no more* and *neither any more*, make an unexceptionable denial, or aſſert that ſuch a thing or event ſhall never again return. And this is always their plain and natural meaning, when they are not qualified, or diverted from their natural courſe, by other words. Or unleſs the nature of the ſubject, to which they are joined, forbid a ſtrict denial. Accordingly, to make us believe that the promiſes of future happineſs are given in decided terms, in oppoſition to the threatenings of future miſery, Dr. C. and Mr. W. make uſe of Luke xx. 36. "Neither can they,' the ſaints in heaven, 'die *any more*;' and Rev. xxi. 4. 'And there ſhall be *no more* 'death.' Dr. C. ſays, 'As the above ſcriptures expreſsly af-'firm, that the *righteous* ſhall not die *any more*, ſhall *not die* 'again, after the general reſurrection, we are abſolutely obliged 'to underſtand the word AIOONIOS, *everlaſting*, when join-'ed with the *life* of the *righteous*, in the *endleſs ſenſe*.'* And becauſe no ſuch decided terms are joined with the puniſhment of the damned, the meaning of *everlaſting*, in this caſe, Dr. C. ſays, is 'limited to an age, or period of duration only.'† But the whole force of 'the above ſcriptures,' *Neither can they die any more, And there ſhall be no more death*, depends on the negatives, *no more* and *neither any more*. And theſe are more frequently uſed, in the bible, to expreſs a conditional or partial negation, than they are to expreſs a ſtrict and abſolute one. God ſaid to Jacob, 'Thy name ſhall be called *no more* 'Jacob, but Iſrael.'‡ His name, however, was afterwards called Jacob, hundreds of times. God told Hoſea, to call his daughter's name, he had by Gomer, 'Lo-ruhamah: for I will 'no *more* have mercy upon the houſe of Iſrael; but I will ut-'terly take them away.'§ Many of Iſrael afterwards incorporated with Judah; ſo that they were, in the moſt ſtrict ſenſe, neither cut off from *mercy* nor *taken away*. And thoſe of Iſrael who were *taken away*, the LORD ſaid concerning them, 'Let mine outcaſts dwell with thee, Moab; be thou a covert to 'them from the face of the ſpoiler.'‖ When the remnant of Judah, contrary to divine command, went down into Egypt, as related in Jerem. xliv, the LORD ſaid, 'Behold, I have ſworn by 'my great name, that my name ſhall *no more* be named in the 'mouth of any man of Judah in all the land of Egypt, ſaying, 'the LORD God liveth.'¶ After this time, and at the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, multitudes of Jews lived at Alexandria

* P. 287, 288. † Ibid. ‡ Gen. 32. 28. § Chap. 1. 6. ‖ Iſai. 16. 4. ¶ v. 26.

and other parts of Egypt; where they, in ſome meaſure, maintained the true worſhip of God. By looking into the bible, we find that theſe words, *no more* and *neither any more*, are uſed more frequently in a partial ſenſe, than they are as univerſal, unlimited negatives. Therefore, to follow the Doctor's rule, 'If 'we will confine ourſelves to the *mere force* of the *words* '*themſelves*, they more probably mean a *partial*, than an *uni-* 'verſal negation; and for this very good reaſon, becauſe *this* 'is, by far, the moſt frequent uſe of them in the ſacred writings.' Hence the above ſcriptures are nothing to Dr. C's purpoſe. By virtue of his own rule, they only prove that the inhabitants of heaven ſhall *die no more* while they live, and there ſhall not be *any more* death again for a certain period; whether *longer* or *ſhorter*, as he ſays of eternity. And whereas Dr. C. conſiders theſe ſcriptures exactly the ſame as *immortal*, and the promiſe of *immortality*, his argument from *theſe* alſo, by his own rule, is totally deſtroyed. The redeemed in heaven are immortal while they are immortal; they are immortal for a certain period, and how long this will laſt Dr. C. cannot tell, until he has given up his own maxim.

No end, world without end, Mr. Winchester ſays, 'Are 'ſtronger expreſſions to ſet forth the well-being of the righteous, 'than any that are uſed as connected with the miſery of the wick-'ed.'* How does this appear? The phraſe, *no end*, is uſed more frequently in the *limited*, than in the *endleſs* ſenſe. In the former ſenſe it is uſed ſeven times,† throughout the ſcripture, in the latter ſenſe it is but four times uſed. And two of theſe, viz. Iſai. ix. 7. Luke i. 33, as they expreſs the duration of the reign of Chriſt, are not allowed, by univerſaliſts, to have an unlimited meaning. Dr. C. and Mr. W. deny that Chriſt's kingdom and government has no end. One of the remainder, viz. Heb. vii. 3, is applied to Melchiſedec,—'Having neither 'beginning of days, *nor end* of life;' and, as it relates to Melchiſedec, is uſed figuratively, therefore it is nothing to their purpoſe. We are, of courſe, reduced to this one paſſage, Pſal. cii. 27. 'Thou (God) art the ſame, and thy years have *no end*.' This, of itſelf, is not a 'ſtronger expreſſion to ſet forth the well-'being of the righteous;' but the promiſe to them directly follows *this*. 'The children of thy ſervants ſhall continue, and 'their ſeed, EIS TON AIOONA KATEUTHUNTHESE-'TAI, ſhall be eſtabliſhed before thee.' So that EIS TON AIOONA, *to eternity*, or to be eſtabliſhed *to eternity*, is the ſame

* P. 33. † The places are, Eccl. 4. 8, 16, and 12. 12. Iſai. 2. 7, twice. Nah. 2. 9, and 3. 3.

ſame, in Greek, as *to be eſtabliſhed before thee*, or before God. And EIS TON AIOONA is the ſame as to duration, as *thy years have no end.* But Dr. C's rule deſtroys the force of this laſt expreſſion; for *no end* is uſed moſt in the limited ſenſe. And EIS TON AIOONA, he argues, is of no ſignificancy, as to duration, even when applied to God himſelf. By explaining away *eternity*, therefore, they explain away their own 'ſtronger 'expreſſions.' Again, as to the expreſſion, *world without end*, we find two inſtances of its uſe, in the bible: Iſai. xlv. 17, and Eph. iii. 21. As to the original words, of both theſe places, Dr. C. and Mr. W. have done their utmoſt, to explain them away to nothing. And had Mr. W. only cited the Greek words from Iſai. xlv. 17, he muſt, to have been conſiſtent, called his expreſſions, 'to ſet forth the well-being of the righteous,' *weaker*, inſtead of *ſtronger*. The *weaker*, however, appears to lie with Mr. W's uſe of them, and not with the expreſſions themſelves. The Greek words, for *world without end*, in this caſe, are EOOS TOU AIOONOS ETI; which Dr. C. calls *forever and farther*, which he alſo calls *evident nonſenſe*.

After citing theſe words from Iſaiah, 'Iſrael ſhall be ſaved in 'the LORD with an everlaſting ſalvation: ye ſhall not be aſham-'ed nor confounded world without end,' Mr. W. ſays, 'But 'where do we read that the miſery of the wicked ſhall have *no* 'end? The word *endleſs*, or *world without end*, is never 'once uſed by our tranſlators, to expreſs the eternity of puniſh-'ment, in the whole bible.'* Had it been ſaid, in ſcripture, 'The miſery of the wicked ſhall have *no end*,' Mr. W. could then have denied it, with the ſame boldneſs as he has denied that Chriſt's kingdom ſhall have *no end*;'† when it is aſſerted, 'Of 'the increaſe of his government and peace there ſhall be *no end*,' Iſai. ix. 7; and Luke i. 33, 'He ſhall reign over the houſe of 'Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there ſhall be *no end*.'—The word *endleſs* is uſed twice only. 1 Tim. i. 4. 'Neither 'give heed to fables, and *endleſs* genealogies.' And Heb. vii. 16, 'Who is made,' Chriſt is made, 'not after the law of a car-'nal commandment, but after the power of an *endleſs* life.' To explain *forever and ever*, joined, in ſeveral places, with the torment of the damned, Mr. W. ſays, 'I ſhall now invalidate 'thoſe evidences for *endleſs damnation*, by bringing an equal 'number of texts, where you will allow the words are uſed in a 'limited ſenſe.'‡ Following this and Dr. C's rule, which we have ſeen, the word *endleſs*, as it is juſt as often uſed in the limited, as in the unlimited ſenſe, can have *no* meaning. The unlimited

* P. 34. † P. 28—29. ‡ P. 21.

limited ſenſe *invalidates* the limited, and the limited *invalidates* the unlimited; thus it becomes a ſound without ſenſe. But Dr. C. and Mr. W. have abundantly uſed this word, *endleſs*, to give advantage, as it appears, to their ſubject, by exhibiting their arguments in the cleareſt manner. Unhappily, we are obliged to call on their advocates, to tell us the meaning of the principal word, which ſtamps the character of their books. It could have been wiſhed, however, that Dr. C. had given the world his *endleſs nothing*, or rather his *endleſs contradictions*, on ſome other than the moſt ſerious ſubject of *eternity*.—— Your indulgence, my dear ſir, is ſolicited, while we ſee, in one more inſtance, the operation of this ſingular rule or maxim.

The word *all* is a material word with univerſaliſts. They appear, many times, to place their chief dependance on thoſe ſcriptures, which include this word. As, John xii. 32, 'And 'I (Chriſt Jeſus), if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw *all* '*men* unto me.' Rom. v. 18,—'even ſo by the righteouſneſs 'of one the free gift came upon *all men* unto juſtification of 'life.' 1 Cor. xv. 22, 'For as in Adam *all* die, even ſo in 'Chriſt ſhall *all* be made alive. Eph. i. 10, 'That in the diſ'penſation of the fulneſs of times he might gather together in 'one *all* things in Chriſt.' 1 Tim. ii. 4, 5, 6, 'Who will have '*all men* to be ſaved, and to come unto the knowledge of the 'truth. For there is one God, and one mediator—Who gave 'himſelf a ranſom for *all*:' and other like places.

This word *all*, is well known to be a term of the ſtricteſt univerſality; including the whole of whatever ſubject it is applied to. This is its firſt, moſt obvious, and natural meaning. And in this ſenſe it is always underſtood, when it is not qualified or reſtricted by other words; or unleſs the nature of the ſubject, it is applied to, forbid this conſtruction. It is, however, uſed in the greateſt variety; and more often in common converſation, as well as in the bible, uſed in a *partial*, than in an *univerſal* ſenſe. For the truth of this, we need only to appeal to facts and to the ſacred volume. Dr. C. and Mr. W. allow of no qualifications or reſtrictions of its uſe, in the above ſcripture paſſages; but, in each of theſe and in other like places, they take the word *all* in its moſt ſtrict univerſal ſenſe. At the ſame time, they have given us no reaſon, why this word ſhould not be enterpreted by their own rule, the rule by which they explain the word *eternity*. And it muſt be a very odd maxim that will not apply in all ſimilar caſes. And this word, *all*, though uſed in a great variety, is as naturally and really an unlimited term as the

word

word eternal; but the former is not more unlimited than the latter. *All* exiſtence, *all* duration is as boundleſs, but not more ſo, as eternal duration or eternal exiſtence. Therefore, unleſs ſome reaſon can be given, more than has yet been given, we are obliged to interpret this unlimited word, *all*, by the ſame rule we do other unlimited words. Dr. C. and Mr. W, for ought they have done or ſaid, are conſtrained to interpret it as they do *eternity* and its derivatives, By this maxim, therefore, as *all* is more often uſed in a *partial* ſenſe, than in an *univerſal*, it 'more probably means' the former, than it does the latter, and whenever it is uſed. *All men*, therefore, more probably than otherwiſe, always means ſome men only. Or, it is probale that *all men* always means a part of mankind, inſtead of the whole. Certainly, if *everlaſting*, by 'the *mere force* of the *word itſelf*, more probably means a *limited*, than an *endleſs* duration; 'and becauſe this is the moſt frequent uſe of it in the ſacred 'writings;' it follows that the moſt probable ſenſe of *all* is only a *part*, and always only a *part*, inſtead of the whole; for it is more often uſed *partially*, than *univerſally*, in the ſacred writings. And if *everlaſting* is *no* determinate *ſignificancy*, as to duration, when applied to God himſelf, and for the reaſon above mentioned; then, for the ſame reaſon, the word *all* is of no determinate ſignificancy, when applied to men. By the *mere force* of the *word itſelf*, *all men* can never intend any thing more than *ſome men*. And as, for the reaſon above ſtated, *eternity* always means ſimple duration, whether *longer* or *ſhorter*, ſo *all men* always means *ſome men*, whether the number be more or leſs—whether even one man, a thouſand, or the whole of the human race. The moſt probable meaning however, in this caſe, is always only a part of mankind, inſtead of the whole. Here we have the genuine operations of the Doctor's rule, by which he explains away *eternity*; for it muſt operate alike in all ſimilar caſes.

Mr. W, to prevent uncertainty and confuſion as to the meaning of this word, ſays, 'I lay down this plain rule; viz. When 'the word *all* is uſed in any paſſage of ſcripture, and we are not 'neceſſarily obliged, either by the context or ſome other text or 'the nature and circumſtances of the caſe, to underſtand it *partially*; and eſpecially, where any important point of doctrine 'is ſpoken of we are always to underſtand it *univerſally without exception*.'* A direct contradiction to what he ſays of *forever and ever*, ſeveral times joined with the puniſhment of the damned. This evidence for endleſs puniſhment he *invalidates*,

* P. 42.

dates, he ſays, 'by bringing an equal number of texts, in which '*forever and ever* are uſed in a limited ſenſe.' But we are now favored with two rules. Which of theſe ſhall we follow? They are both of them common fixed maxims with Dr. C. and Mr. W. And either of them overthrows their ſcheme. The *former*, as it gives a juſt definition of the term *all*, leads to a juſt definition of *eternity* and its derivatives, ſo as to ſhow us their natural import, in the endleſs ſenſe; alſo when to underſtand their reſtricted ſenſe. And this is ſuited to overthrow their ſcheme. The *latter*, as it explains away every unlimited word in the bible, explains away the word *all* in the ſame proceſs. Of courſe, Mr. Wincheſter's *all* and Dr. Chauncy's *all*, take their departure with it.

It will now be objected, that the ſenſe of this word is fixed, beyond diſpute; in the above paſſages, and in others, which expreſs or imply *the ſalvation of all men*. As in Rom. v. 18. 'Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon *all men* 'to condemnation; even ſo by the righteouſneſs of one the free 'gift came upon *all men* unto juſtification of life.' Here the *free gift*, which came upon *all men*, is as extenſive and univerſal as the *judgment*, which came upon *all men*. And *all men* are the ſame in both caſes, which muſt include every one of mankind. For it cannot be denied that *judgment* came upon every one of mankind. Therefore, *all men*, upon whom the *free gift* came, are, decidedly, every one of the human kind. Again, 1 Cor. xv. 22. 'For as in Adam *all* die, even ſo in Chriſt ſhall *all* be made 'alive.' Here the *all* that ſhall be made alive in Chriſt, is the ſame *all* that die in Adam. And this latter *all* is granted to be the whole of Adam's race; therefore, the former *all* muſt intend the ſame.

Anſwer. To follow the Doctor's mode of reaſoning, how do we know, in this caſe, what is meant either by the *former* or *latter*? Or how do we know that theſe words, *as in Adam all die*, ſtrictly mean *all men*? Of courſe, how can we draw the parallel, ſo as ſtrictly to decide that *all men* ſhall be made alive in Chriſt? Confining ourſelves to the *mere force* of the word *all*, we cannot ſtrictly decide any thing by it. *All die in Adam*, moſt probably means that only *ſome* die in Adam. Therefore, *all ſhall be made alive in Chriſt*, moſt probably means that only *ſome* ſhall be made alive in Chriſt. And what this *ſome* is no man can determine. Again, as to this text in Romans, we know nothing of what is meant by the *all men*, upon whom the *judgment* came to condemnation. Therefore, we are ignorant of

what

what is meant by the *all men*, upon whom the *free gift* came unto juſtification of life. Furthermore, when it is ſaid, Chriſt is the ſaviour of *all men*, we muſt firſt decide what is underſtood by *all men*. But, before we can do this, Dr. C's maxim muſt be renounced; what he has ſaid on *eternity*, muſt firſt be given up. Dr. C. is, therefore, reduced to this dilemma; either he muſt give up the word *all*, on which his *all* depends, or he muſt give up his explanation of the word *eternity*, &c.

It will again be objected, that we know, from the nature of the ſubject, that *all men*, every one, *die in Adam*. Therefore, we are neceſſitated to conſider the latter *all*, *all ſhall be made alive in Chriſt*, in its moſt ſtrict univerſal ſenſe.

Anſwer. From the nature of the ſubject, we know nothing about *all* dying in Adam; for the knowledge of this, we are wholly indebted to Revelation. Although it is plain, from facts, we all die, yet it is alſo plain that we muſt go to the bible, to know whether, or not, we all die in Adam.

It will, perhaps, be further objected, that, from the general tenor of ſcripture, it is plain that *all men*, every individual, do indeed die in Adam. Therefore, we are compelled to conſider the latter *all*, *all ſhall be made alive in Chriſt*, in its greateſt latitude.

Anſwer, From the general tenor of ſcripture, to reaſon as the Doctor does, we are compelled to conſider the epithet *all*, in every caſe, quite the reverſe, or to mean *a part* only. And for this very good reaſon, becauſe this word is more frequently uſed, in ſcripture, to mean only *a part*, than it is to intend *the whole*. Hence, the Doctor, to *invalidate* ſome of the moſt important parts of ſcripture, has invented a rule, which *invalidates* his own favorite expreſſions. Of courſe, he muſt tell us what he means by 'the ſalvation of all men;' whether *all men* mean only *ſome men*, or every individual. To be conſiſtent with his own maxim, he muſt write his book over again, and explain his title page. '*The ſalvation of all men the grand* '*thing aimed at*,' &c. and tell us whether *ſome* or *the whole*, is here intended. Should he ſay, *the whole*, is intended, by the epithet *all*, then again he muſt give a ſecond explanation, to tell us his meaning of this expreſſion, *the whole*. When he has done this, he muſt give a third explanation, to ſhow his meaning of the ſecond. A fourth for the third, &c. &c. &c. What the Doctor calls *eternity*, it is thought, would run out, before he will have completed this *grand ſcheme*.

As to the above texts, alſo Coloſ. i. 20. 'By him (Chriſt) to 'reconcile *all thinge* unto himſelf;' Philip. ii. 10, 11,

'That

'That at the name of Jeſus *every knee* ſhould bow,——and 'that every tongue ſhould confeſs that Chriſt is Lord;' and Heb. ii. 8. 'Thou haſt put *all things* in ſubjection under his 'feet,' and others of like import, on which univerſaliſts place ſo much dependence, you will, my dear friend, find an accurate explanation of them, in Dr. Edwards's anſwer to Dr. C. Chap. ix, xi, xii. In which Dr. E. appears to make it plain that theſe texts, inſtead of proving the final ſalvation of all men, prove the oppoſite. Several objections alſo, which Dr. C. brings againſt the meaning of the words we are now interpreting, which are here omitted, you will find anſwered by Dr. E. We ſhall therefore cloſe this *letter*, and finiſh this ſubject, with the following remarks.

I. That a man of Dr. C's talents and learning ſhould give ſuch a rule for the interpretation of words, as we have ſeen, is not a little ſurpriſing. Who could have thought of firſt telling the number of times ſuch or ſuch a *word*, in the bible, is uſed, either in the *lax* or *ſtrict* ſenſe, in the limited or unlimited ſenſe, in order to determine its moſt probable meaning? Who could have thought of this, had not his ſcheme been in diſtreſs? The Doctor's rule is the ſame as to ſay, becauſe *ſuch* a word more often occurs in the *lax*, than in the *ſtrict* ſenſe, therefore in its *lax* ſenſe *this* word muſt always be underſtood. In this caſe, the *lax* deſtroys the *ſtrict*, and what name to give the former, when the latter is deſtroyed, is left with univerſaliſts to decide. And if the former has ſuch power over the latter, how came the latter ever to have an exiſtence? Again, following Dr. C's maxim, if a word is more often uſed in a temporal ſenſe than it is in an eternal, then this great frequency of *temporal* ſo alters *eternal*, as to make it *temporal*, in all caſes; which is the ſame as to ſay, that *temporal* deſtroys *eternal*. And if *temporal* deſtroys *eternal*, how came the word *eternal* into being? And why a diſtinction between *temporal* and *eternal*? The ſame rule applies, as we have ſeen, to the word *infinite*. Therefore, becauſe this word is more often employed about finite, than about infinite, ſubjects, *finite* deſtroys *infinite*. But the Doctor's difficulty lies here, he cannot tell how often *eternity* and its derivatives is uſed in the endleſs ſenſe. How can he tell, when by the *mere force* of the word, it moſt probably intends, in all caſes, a temporal duration? And how can he tell by the help of other words, ſtanding with *this*, when his own rule deſtroys the unlimited ſenſe of all other words? This is known, he would ſay, by the nature of the ſubject. But how do we

know

know the nature of the ſubject, how do we know the duration of unſeen things, any further than revelation informs us? And how does revelation inform us, when the *mere force* of its words is deſtroyed? Therefore, when Dr. C. ſays, '*Everlaſting* more 'probably means a *limited*, than an *endleſs*, duration; becauſe 'this is, by far, the moſt frequent uſe of it in the ſacred writ-'ings,' this is a mere ſolecism. There is no *moſt* or compariſon in the caſe; *everlaſting*, for ought he can tell by his own maxim, always means a limited duration. It is impoſſible for him, however, to determine what it does mean, or whether it means any thing. And the word which he takes to be the moſt determinate, and uſes ſo frequently, only turns againſt him. The word *endleſs* is juſt as often uſed, in ſcripture, in a limited, as it is in an unlimited manner. Which forms a blank in his book, and blank indeed it is.

II. The rule, by which, to aſcertain the meaning of words, is plain and ſimple. Words are arbitary ſigns of ideas. Theſe ſigns are not originated or made by a few wiſe men of the age; but they are made, or rather their import is fixed, by the aſſent of the populace, the great maſs of the people. To know the meaning of words, therefore, we need only to know how they are underſtood, by the people at large. In this caſe, it is uſeful to enquire how they were originally underſtood, and how they have been, from age to age, bringing of it down to the preſent time. But as words, in general, retain their primary ſenſe from time immemorial, ſo their original gives their preſent meaning, and their preſent their original meaning. It is granted, in ſome few inſtances, the ſenſe of words is varied, by length of time, or rather by incidental events. But this variation is always plain and intelligible. For if the ſenſe of words be not aſcertained, they are no longer uſed. Men, eſpecially in matters intereſting, do not often ſpeak in an unknown tongue; when, at the ſame time, they can uſe words ſo as to be underſtood. And the reaſon why words uſually retain their primary ſenſe, is, the ſenſe of words is not fixed in the ſchools of philoſophers, but by the common people, converſing on their intereſting and neceſſary matters. So when God gave a revelation to men, as it was not deſigned for a few individuals only, it was given in words beſt adapted to the whole nation, and to the whole human race, when they ſhould come to the knowledge of it. It is here worthy of ſpecial notice that the ſenſe of words is kept pure and genuine, without any material variation, throughout the old teſtament. And throughout the new teſtament, there is no variation, as to

the ſenſe of words, worth remarking. This affords a very rational argument, to ſay the leaſt of it, that the ſenſe of thoſe important words, which treat of unſeen and eternal things, was handed down by the apoſtles, and maintained by the body of the church, with but little variation or oppoſition, till towards the end of the laſt century. And whereas the great body of chriſtians have all along taken *eternity* and its derivatives, when applied to things of the next world, to intend endleſs duration, this, as it appears, does fix their true meaning. This leads to remark,

III. It is immaterial whether an unlimited word is uſed out of its natural courſe, or in a limited ſenſe, more frequently, or not, than it is otherwiſe. It may be uſed five times, or even five hundred times, more, in a limited, than it is in an unlimited manner; and this make no difference as to its proper ſtrict meaning. Were not this the caſe, it would be impoſſible to know the meaning of words. This is alſo illuſtrated and proved by the word *infinite*. Reckoning one marginal reading, this word occurs four times, in the whole bible. And but one inſtance out of theſe four, according to Dr. C, can be taken ſtrictly. But the three, out of four, inſtances of its figurative uſe have no influence upon its ſtrict literal uſe. This one inſtance of its literal uſe, ſtanding againſt three of the oppoſite ſenſe, is not, by the three, impaired or altered in its meaning. To ſuppoſe otherwiſe would plunge us into confuſion. What is here ſtated is plain from the facts themſelves. When it is ſaid of the LORD, as in Pſal. cxlvii. 5, 'his underſtanding is infinite,' it is evident this muſt be taken literally. There is nothing in the bible to forbid this conſtruction. And this agrees with what the bible ſays of the other attributes of Jehovah. But when *infinite* is joined with the riches of Nineveh, the caſe is equally plain. We know that the nature of this ſubject obliges us to conſider this uſe of the word in a figurative manner. Were *infinite* uſed five hundred times in this manner, being joined with ſubjects we know to be finite, it could make no confuſion or miſtake. According to its natural import, it would ſtill retain its unlimited force. Or, when uſed ſimply or alone, having no words ſtanding with it to alter its meaning, and the ſubject not forbidding it, it would ſtill intend *infinite*.

IV. When this, or any other unlimited word, is uſed in a figurative or limited ſenſe, the limitation is obvious. We muſt know that the ſubject forbids the ſtrict meaning, or that the words ſtanding with it, either expreſſed or plainly underſtood, turn it from its natural courſe, otherwiſe we are obliged to take

it

it in its literal import. If this be not granted, it will follow, either that words are mere ſounds without ſenſe, or that every individual reader and hearer is left to put his own arbitrary interpretation upon them. However, the example of the uſe of the word *infinite* is ſufficient to determine this point. And we are obliged to take this word in its literal import, when it is not obviouſly limited, as in the manner juſt ſtated.

V. If a word can be found, ſtanding alone, or not altered in its ſenſe by other words, and we are neceſſitated to conſider this word an unlimited one, or conveying an unlimited idea in the place where it is thus found, this is ſufficient to decide its natural meaning; and that this word naturally has an unlimited meaning, although but one inſtance of this uſe of it be found in the whole bible. A word ſtanding alone, or not depending on other words, or varied in its ſenſe by other words, is ſtanding in its own ſimple natural force. This none can deny. And it is the natural force of the word we want to know, to know its natural meaning. For its natural power and force is its natural meaning. Therefore, if we are neceſſitated to take this one inſtance of the uſe of this word in the unlimited ſenſe, it follows that we are neceſſitated, at the ſame time, to conſider the natural meaning of this word to be unlimited. For it is the mere ſimple power of this word, and nothing elſe, which gives this unlimited idea. And if the mere ſimple power of this word gives this unlimited idea, then this word, by its own power, is ſuited to convey this unlimited idea, and no other. It cannot, of itſelf, convey any other, unleſs it be an oppoſite one; for any thing ſhort of *unlimited* is *limited;* and the latter of theſe ſtands oppoſed to the former. And to ſuppoſe that a word, of itſelf, can give oppoſite ideas, or that a word, by its own force, can give either a limited or an unlimited meaning, throws every thing into confuſion. Words may be uſed ironically, ſo they may be uſed figuratively, but this is out of their natural courſe. In theſe caſes, the irony or figure muſt be plain and ſtriking, ſo as to avoid confuſion. Therefore, if a word, by its own ſimple power, is ſuited to convey an unbounded idea, and conſequently no other; one inſtance of its uſe gives a decided example as well as a thouſand. To deny this, is denying the power of words. Hence it is plain, if a word can be found, ſtanding as above ſtated, uſed but once in this manner throughout the ſcripture, and we are compelled to take it in the unlimited ſenſe, this is ſufficient to ſettle its natural meaning; and that this word naturally has an unbounded meaning. For it is the ſimple power of this word, and nothing elſe, which gives this unbounded idea.

It will now be objected, that the nature of the ſubject, words are applied to, oftentimes ſettles their meaning.

Anſwer. As to inviſible objects, treated of in the bible, what do we know about their nature, any further than the bible reveals them? And how does the bible reveal them, except it be by certain words? Let univerſaliſts prove, if they can, by ſome authority aſide from ſcripture, the nature and attributes of that God who ſpake to Moſes. Reaſon proves, it is granted, the attributes of the creator and governor of the world. But reaſon, or the light of nature, does not prove this to be the God who ſpake to Moſes, unleſs ſcripture gives him this character. So that our dependence is on ſcripture, to prove the nature of ſcripture ſubjects: and on the words of ſcripture, and finally on the *mere force* of the words themſelves, and nothing elſe.

It is clear that the nature of the underſtanding of the LORD, joined with the word *infinite*, is aſcertained, in this place, by the power of this word only. And that this epithet is applied to his underſtanding to decide its nature, and to deſignate him as the ſupreme God. It is alſo clear, as we are compelled to take this one ſolitary uſe (as Dr. C. argues it to be) of *infinite*, in the unlimited ſenſe, that this is ſufficient to decide its natural import. And when uſed in any other but the unlimited ſenſe, it muſt be taken in a looſe or figurative manner. Furthermore, the uſe of this word, *infinite*, muſt ſtand as an example for all other unlimited expreſſions. One ſingle example decides their natural import as well as a thouſand.

It will again be objected, that the words *infinite*, *unſearchable*, *unchangeable*, by their own etymology and compoſition, ſtand oppoſed to *finite*, *ſearchable*, *changeable*.

Anſwer. It is granted that the negative particles, added to the former, invert their meaning, and place them in oppoſition to the latter. But Dr. C's rule confounds them together. And, in reality, the former is not more oppoſed to the latter, than *eternal* is to *temporal*.—'The things which are ſeen are *temporal*, but the things which are not ſeen are *eternal*.'

It will be further objected, that as a finite ſubject neceſſarily limits a word, which is applied to it, ſo an infinite ſubject neceſſarily fixes the ſenſe of a word, which is applied to it; and obliges us to take this word in the unlimited ſenſe. If the nature of the ſubject, in the firſt inſtance, gives the ſenſe of the word, then certainly it muſt be the nature of the ſubject, in the ſecond inſtance, by which the ſenſe of the word is given. Therefore, it is the nature of the ſubject; and not the force of the word, which gives the idea.

Anſwer.

Anſwer, When the nature of the ſubject, in both caſes, is well known, this rule will apply. But when the nature of the ſubject in the firſt inſtance is well known, and in the ſecond is wholly unknown, this rule will not apply. How can a ſubject, wholly unknown, give force and energy to words? In this caſe, words may deſcribe the ſubject, but the ſubject cannot give meaning to words. 'It was the original intent of unlimited words, eſpecially of *eternity*, *eternal*, *everlaſting*, &c. to reveal to us *unſeen things*. Things which lie beyond the reach of mortal eye. Things which the united wiſdom of this world never could have diſcovered. 'Eye hath not ſeen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God 'hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed 'them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit ſearcheth all things, 'yea, the deep things of God.—The things of God knoweth no 'man, but the Spirit of God.'* It is, indeed, the work of the Holy Ghoſt to draw aſide the curtain, and lay open the things of the inviſible world. And as man knows nothing of theſe things, any further than the Spirit reveals them, ſo it is the words of revelation, which is revelation itſelf, that ſhows him the nature of theſe things. What could man have known of heaven or hell, had not God revealed them? What could he have known of the nature and duration of either of theſe, had not God declared it? And how has God declared it, unleſs by certain ſigns or words, communicated to our ſenſes? Therefore, it is wholly by the power of words we become acquainted with *unſeen things*; and with their nature and duration. To ſay we learn the force of words, and are obliged to interpret them, from the *previous known nature* of the ſubject, when we know nothing of the ſubject, only as words reveal it, is a clear contradiction, and it is inverting the order of things. When the nature of the ſubject is well known, as objects of ſight or worldly things are, we may then argue from the *previous known nature* of the ſubject. Hence, a rule will apply to *things ſeen*, which cannot apply to *things unſeen*.

After all it will be objected, that, according to the above reaſoning, if only one ſcripture inſtance be found, of a word uſed in the limited ſenſe, and we cannot otherwiſe interpret this inſtance, we are obliged to conſider this its direct meaning; and when it is found in the unlimited ſenſe, this is its figurative uſe. For the above rule muſt operate both ways.

Anſwer, When a word is figuratively uſed, as we have often ſeen, the figure is always obvious and ſtriking; being grounded on

* 1 Cor. ii. 9, 10, 11.

on something we well understand. It is the well-known nature of the subject, to which a word is joined, that gives the figure. This is self-evident. Therefore, would we use a limited term by a figure, in the unlimited sense, we must apply it to an object already known. Again, an unlimited word, if used figuratively, must be joined to things within the reach of our senses; otherwise it would be received as literal, instead of figurative. The strength of Nineveh is called *infinite*, and without any hazard of mistake; because the subject, in this case, is well understood. But if angels, or other invisible beings, were called *infinite*, in strength or knowledge, we should be obliged to consider them as such, provided there were no words to contradict this. And if there were, it would only cause confusion. Should angels, in one place of scripture, be called infinite, in another, finite, dependent beings; which of these places could we take figuratively, or which literally? Should their duration, in one place, be called *eternal*, in another, *temporal*, what would be the consequence? Or should they be said to exist *for ages of ages*, this term, by its own power, being supposed to mean only limited duration, but, figuratively, may intend duration without end; we can at once see the consequence. At best, we should be in the dark, and could never decide whether angels are to exist forever or not; whether they are finite or infinite; what they are, or whether they are any thing. Hence, the above objection, however it may apply to *things seen*, cannot to things invisible. On this ground, a word, according to its own original meaning, cannot be considered as limited, in one place, and unlimited, in another, by a figurative use. Concerning things of the unknown world, which things are wholly unknown to us except by the power of words, how is it possible to conceive a ground of distinction between the figurative or the literal use of words? Universalists will now say, the endless duration of angels is decided by other words; and the term *forever*, when employed about them, must be figurative, if it denote the extent of their duration; because this term, in its primary sense, is known to be a limited one. To answer this, Dr. C. has so confounded *limited* and *unlimited* together, as to leave every thing undecided. But supposing a word, in its primary sense, limited, and another, in the same sense, unlimited, were employed about angels; which of these could we believe?

Furthermore. As it is the well-known nature of the subject, or the subject itself, to which the word is joined, and not the authority of the word, that gives the figure or metaphor; so *eternity*,

nity, if it mean endleſs duration only by a metaphor, muſt have this meaning given it by the nature of the ſubject only, to which it is joined. The ſame thing Dr. C. often urges. His ſcheme therefore comes to this, that neither *eternity* nor *eternal* were deſigned, by their original primary authority, to mean endleſs duration. Neither can they be thus found in one place of ſcripture.——But,

VI. It appears evident, if one inſtance only of the uſe of each and either of theſe words can be found, in the ſacred volume, that muſt be received, by its own direct authority, to mean endleſs duration, and cannot mean otherwiſe, this is ſufficient to aſcertain their original meaning. A word cannot give oppoſite meanings, when taken in its primary ſenſe. A word cannot naturally intend both a limited and an unlimited duration. Neither, by its own ſimple authority, can it, in one place intend the former, and in another, the latter; for the former is oppoſed to the latter, as has been ſhown.

But who will deny theſe inſtances above cited? When God lifts his hand to heaven, and ſwears, 'I live *forever*;' who will ſay this does not intend an abſolute eternity? Who will ſay, ſtronger terms could be uſed? Thoſe numerous inſtances of, *forever*, uſed as ſtrict negatives; thoſe numerous inſtances alſo, to expreſs the duration of divine mercy; and that in Chriſt's form of prayer, 'Thine is the kingdom, and the power and the 'glory, *forever*;' who will deny the literal uſe of theſe?

It is now ſubmitted to the reader, whether we have not the ſame reaſon to believe, that *eternity* and the words derived from it, in their primary ſenſe, mean boundleſs duration, as we have to believe the moſt plain truths of revelation. And whether, if we interpret theſe words as Dr. Chauncy does, we do not run into all the abſurdities above ſtated; even to the entire ſubverſion of the goſpel.

VII. The remark, commonly made on univerſaliſts, that they can hardly believe their own ſcheme, appears to be juſt. Becauſe they ſo often ſhift and alter and croſs their own track, in contradiction to common ſenſe. And it is remarkable, that they ſometimes appear to allow the ſtrict ſenſe of the words we are upon, juſt in the light above ſtated; excepting when they are applied to the puniſhment of the damned; and then, they ſay, theſe words muſt be taken in a figurative, inſtead of a literal ſenſe. This is ſhifting their ground, and in a great meaſure giving up their ſcheme. But this ground they cannot hold, as appears from the foregoing, and may further appear from the following.

1. 'Fire,

1. 'Fire, as such,' Dr. Chauncy says, 'naturally tends to an *end*, and will, in time, actually come to an *end*; and it is impossible, according to the established laws of nature, but that it should certainly do so. The *nature* of the *subject*, therefore obliges us to put a *limitation* on the word *everlasting*, when joined with *fire*.'*

Being aware that the strict eternity of these *words* cannot be denied, the Doctor would have them considered as figurative, when joined with the *fire* of hell, or torments of the damned. But, from the things of this, he here argues the nature of the things of the coming world. He might as well have said, it is the nature of all creature happiness to come to an end; because the pleasures of this life soon vanish away; and because Adam soon fell, and lost all his happiness. The truth is, if we argue the nature of the things in the unseen world, from what we notice in this, we supercede revelation. God has declared the latter to be *temporal*, and the former *eternal*. Which is sufficient to determine the *nature* of the *subject*, in either case. And God is as able to continue the fire of hell without end, as he is for the shortest period. Furthermore, If *fire* has such a tendency to come to an end, Dr. C. cannot prove the fire of hell will last for *ages* of *ages*. Which is necessary for him to do, otherwise he cannot prove that all the damned will have repentance; consequently will not all be saved.

2. Dr. C. says, 'There is a very *wide difference*, in the *natures* of the *subjects*, between *happiness* and *misery*, *reward* and *punishment*. The *former* is a token of the *good pleasure* of God, and the fruit of his *infinite mercy*; while the *latter* is his *strange work*, and what he takes *no pleasure in*.' Therefore, the Doctor concludes 'that we may, yea that we ought, to limit the word *everlasting*, with respect to the *one*; while we extend it, with respect to the *other*, as far as it will bear,'‡ or without end. This *strange work*, so much insisted on by Dr. C. Dr. Witsius shows its original meaning to be God's unusual work, a thing which he rarely does. The same as in Mark xiii. 19. 'For in those days shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God created unto this time, neither shall be.' Also a *strange work*, a rare thing, for God to make an example, and such a terrible example of *vengeance*, of his own professedly covenant people, instead of the heathen.† And the same Jews that suffered this vengeance, it was said of them, 'It shall come to pass, that as the LORD rejoiced over you to do you good, so the

LORD

* P. 229. ‡ P. 238, 286. † *See Witsius on the Covenants*, Vol. I. P. 130.

'LORD ſhall rejoice over you to deſtroy you.'‡ The LORD, therefore, rejoices, not to ſee his creatures miſerable, but to glorify his juſtice. Whether it will require an abſolute eternity or not, to do this to the beſt advantage is the point in diſpute. Hence, this argument of Dr. C's, drawn from the infinite mercy of God, comes to nothing.

Again, what right has he to argue from the *infinite mercy* of God, and, at the ſame time, confound *finite* and *infinite* together? And what right has he to extend the *mercy* of God, in favor of the redeemed, *as far as it will bear*, or to a ſtrict eternity; when he has juſt ſaid this word is of no *ſignificancy*, in point of duration, even when applied to God himſelf?

3. Suppoſing, however, he grants, the ſtrict primary ſenſe of theſe words, and that they are figuratively uſed, as to the ſtate of the damned, which is the ground now choſen; this is a direct contradiction to one of his moſt material arguments. 'It is moſt of all worthy of conſideration,' ſays he, 'that we are naturally and obviouſly led to interpret the word *everlaſting*, when 'joined with the *happineſs* of the *righteous*, in the *endleſs* 'ſenſe, from *other texts* which determine *this* to be its *meaning*.'§ Theſe *other texts* are promiſes that the righteous 'ſhall 'die no more,' &c. Which he ſays are more decided, as to duration, as we have ſeen, than any that deſignate the ſtate of the damned. The Doctor here goes 'upon the ſuppoſition that the '*next* is the *final* ſtate of men.'‖ But if the next ſtate be *final*, he gives up all he has ſaid about the ſenſe of theſe words, and allows their original meaning. 'If the next ſtate (conformably 'to the common mode of thinking) is a ſtate of puniſhment, not 'intended for the cure of the patients themſelves, but to ſatisfy 'the juſtice of God; it is impoſſible all men ſhould be finally 'ſaved.'¶ He ſays again, and to make out his arguments for the figurative uſe of this word as applied to the damned, 'If we 'ſhould ſuppoſe the foregoing ſyſtem (his whole ſcheme) to have 'no truth in it, and the *next ſtate*, agreeably to the common o-'pinion, is FINAL, with reſpect both to the *righteous* and the '*wicked*.'† Therefore, granting the *next ſtate* to be *final*, he allows theſe words, *everlaſting*, &c. to have a ſtrict unlimited meaning, 'conformably to the common mode of think-'ing.' Now ſee the contradiction. He cites *certain texts* 'to 'interpret' *everlaſting*, and grants, for the ſake of preſent argument, that *everlaſting*, by its own authority, 'agreeably to the 'common opinion,' means endleſs duration. At the ſame time, he aſſerts that theſe *certain texts* are ſtronger, more determinate,

‡ Deut. 28. 63. § P. 286. ‖ P. 288. ¶ P. 11. † P. 283.

than *everlaſting*; i. e. more determinate, or ſtronger than what he grants to be endleſs duration! Why could he not have ſpoken directly, and ſaid, that *everlaſting* is ſtronger than *everlaſting?* or endleſs duration is more determinate than endleſs duration?

The caſe is very plain: If we grant the uſe of *everlaſting*, in the ſenſe now ſtated, *other texts* or words, joined to the happineſs of the righteous, cannot interpret *this*, any more than *this* can interpret others. Yea, it appears moſt natural, if the endleſs ſenſe of *this* be granted, that *it* ſhould be taken as the ſtandard by which to interpret all others. Therefore, Dr. C's *ſtronger* words, joined to the happineſs of the righteous, can make no difference as to the uſe of *theſe words*, when connected with the miſery of the wicked. We muſt look out for ſome word or words, immediately or cloſely connected with *forever* and *everlaſting*, which reſtrict them to their figurative uſe, when applied to the ſtate of the damned. And it muſt be obvious that the words thus reſtricting *theſe*, are intended for this uſe. The grant of the land of Canaan, to Abraham and his ſeed, was *forever* throughout their generations. Wherever this term is reſtricted, by words only, it always runs in ſimilar terms; words directly connected with it, which reſtrict it. Were not this the caſe, it would only cauſe confuſion. But where, in all the ſacred volume, is the puniſhment or torment of the damned called *everlaſting*, and this term immediately reſtricted by other words? Where is there any immediate reſtriction, by words, of *this term*, when joined to *unſeen things?* Therefore, when this *word* is uſed unreſtrained by, or about ſubjects wholly unknown or inviſible, other words muſt yield to, or correſpond with *this*, and not *this* with *others*. Eſpecially as *eternity*, and the words derived from it, are the moſt plain and obvious of any in ſcripture, to expreſs an *abſolute* eternity.

Dr. C. would now ſay, he has firſt proved *the ſalvation of all men*, and this naturally reſtricts the ſenſe of *theſe words* as to the damned. But where are his proofs? His argument from the *nature* of the *ſubject* fails. His argument from the mercy of God proves nothing, any more than if he had founded it on divine juſtice. His miſuſe of the word *all*, and other like words, might as well have proved the *damnation*, as the *ſalvation*, of all men.

Dr. C. would again ſay, although the damned have 'judg-' ment without mercy' for a ſeaſon, yet God has promiſed, in the ſame connection, that mercy ſhall finally rejoice againſt judg-

ment,'

ment.' See Jam. ii. 13. It is granted, to thoſe who 'fulfil the 'royal law, Thou ſhalt love thy neighbour as thyſelf,' (v. 8.) mercy does triumph over judgment; but not to thoſe who ſhew no mercy. As in Matt. vi. 14, 15; 'For if ye forgive men 'their treſpaſſes, your heavenly Father will alſo forgive you. 'But if ye forgive not men their treſpaſſes, neither will your 'Father forgive your treſpaſſes.'* Therefore, to ſuch as ſin away the day of grace, juſtice rejoiceth over mercy, *God rejoiceth over them to do them evil.*

Theſe texts alſo univerſaliſts urge. Jerem. iii. 12. 'I am mer-'ciful, ſaith the LORD, and I will not keep anger *forever.*' And Mic. vii. 18. 'He retaineth not his anger *forever*, becauſe he 'delighteth in mercy.' The only queſtion is, to whom are theſe promiſes made; and whether they be made on certain conditions, or unconditionally? And they are made, as any one may ſee, to 'backſliding Iſrael;' on condition of their repentance: Alſo, to the remnant of Judah, provided they are faithful in God's covenant. Which make nothing to their purpoſe. Not only ſo, Dr. C. and Mr. Wincheſter muſt here grant what they have ſo often denied; viz. that *forever*, in both theſe places, means a *ſtrict eternity.* For to ſay, as they muſt, on their ground, that God 'retaineth not his anger' *for an age*, is a direct contradiction to their ſcheme. They allow the damned to have no mercy *for an age*, and even *for ages of ages.*——It is remarkable, that nearly all the *texts* they bring, to ſupport their ſcheme, appear, even upon a ſlighty examination, to be promiſes to the righteous; or made on condition of repentance and obedience, to be performed in this life. Which make *damnation ſure* to a part of mankind, inſtead of *ſalvation* to all. For if ſome men live, and die, deſpiſing theſe conditions, they muſt reap the *curſe*, inſtead of the *bleſſing.* It is now thought to be evident that univerſaliſts cannot maintain their ground. For ought they have ſaid, the *literal*, inſtead of the *figurative*, uſe of *theſe words* muſt be granted, when they are connected with the torments of the damned. But,

4. When the apoſtle, 2 Cor. iv. 18, ſetteth things *ſeen* in oppoſition to *things unſeen*, he evidently means all *unſeen things;* or one as well as another, making no exception. And if, in this caſe, we except one thing, by the ſame rule we may another. As, therefore, the miſery of hell is one *unſeen thing*, and placed in oppoſition to things *ſeen*, which are *temporal;* the miſery of

* God is viſibly, and declares himſelf as ſuch, the Father of all viſible ſaints; there being a viſible relation between them. But to hypocrites, who do not heartily forgive, &c. God will ſay at laſt, 'Go ye curſed, &c.

of hell can be conſidered none other than ſtrictly *eternal;* otherwiſe we confound *temporal* and *eternal* together.

5. All muſt allow the account Chriſt has given of the day of judgment, in Matt. xxv, to be in itſelf complete. Other parts of ſcripture, it is granted, throw light upon *this;* ſo *this* reflects light upon others. But the leading things in this account, who is to be judge, who are to be judged, who acquitted, who condemned, and the final ſentence upon both parties, we may ſafely conclude, are moſt correctly and decidedly given, If we deny this, nothing but difficulty and confuſion will ariſe. As in the following inſtances. Firſt, to ſuppoſe, as Dr. C. does, that the ſentence upon the wicked, in verſes 41, 46, depends wholly on other places, eſpecially the writings of the apoſtle Paul,* for an explanation; is ſaying that one material article of this account is, in or of itſelf, wholly unintelligible, or left in the dark. Secondly, it is impliedly ſaying that Chriſt deſigned to leave the great body of Jews and chriſtians in ignorance, from that day to this, as to one moſt eſſential part of the tranſactions of the judgment day. Therefore, thirdly, this makes a direct contradiction to the words of the apoſtle; Heb. vi. 1, 2. Where he argues that the day of judgment had been accurately defined, and was fully underſtood by the whole body of chriſtians. But if Chriſt had not given an accurate account of this great day, certainly no one had. The apoſtles juſt give a brief ſtatement of it. At the ſame time, they uſe Chriſt's own words, and without any explanation, as to the duration of the curſe upon the damned. Fourthly, to deny Chriſt's account to be, in itſelf, complete, is placing the day of judgment in a very ſingular point of view; even in oppoſition to the whole ſeries of divine conduct, from the beginning to this time. God pronounced ſentence upon the *antediluvians;* Gen. vi. 3, 8, 17. This did not depend wholly on other revealed truths, for an explanation. It was deſigned this threatening ſhould be underſtood, at the time it was delivered, and as it was literally executed. So the threatenings to Pharaoh and the Egyptians, to the Canaanites, Babylonians, and eſpecially to the Jews, were given in terms which could not be miſtaken, inſtead of needing an explanation. And theſe threatenings were literally executed.

Dr. C. is conſtrained to interpret *the judgment of the great day*, in ſuch manner as would *diſgrace* any temporal court, on earth. The chief juſtice, ſuppoſe, pronounces *ſentence* upon a murderer; but it is not known, till afterwards explained, whether this ſentence includes a capital puniſhment, or not! Therefore,

* Nearly the whole of Dr. C's arguments are taken from St. Paul's writings.

fore, to avoid confuſion and direct contradiction of ſcripture, alſo from the nature of the caſe, we are conſtrained to conſider Chriſt's ſtatement of the laſt judgment, every material article of it, as being correct and complete; or not neceſſarily needing an interpretation. Other parts, and even the whole, of revelation ſerve to enforce it, and caſt further light upon it, but are not neceſſary for an explanation of it; certainly, for no one article more than another. Indeed, if one article lies wholly in the dark, till explained; by the ſame rule another, and another, and ſo on; which involves the whole in darkneſs.

Again, as it was the buſineſs of Chriſt to bring 'immortality 'to light through the goſpel,' ſo it muſt, of courſe, have been his buſineſs to give a complete account of the day of judgment. This great work, therefore, could not have been left to the apoſtles; any further than to enforce theſe doctrines, and caſt further light upon them; as has been proved from Heb. vi. 1, 2.

The cloſing words, in deſcribing this awful ſcene, are, 'Theſe 'ſhall go away into everlaſting puniſhment: but the righteous 'into life eternal:' As this is ſpoken of *unſeen* things, ſo the nature of the ſubject cannot reſtrict *everlaſting*, joined with this puniſhment, to a figurative or limited uſe. Therefore words only muſt reſtrict it, if it be thus reſtricted. But not one word, in this whole account, nor even in the four goſpels has Chriſt uſed, which neceſſarily reſtricts it, in this manner. And to pretend to look out for words, for this purpoſe, which were afterwards delivered by the apoſtles, is running into all the confuſion and contradiction above ſtated. And who can admit the thought, that Chriſt ſhould leave this ſo material part of his work unfiniſhed? even his deſcription of the *eternal judgment*, one eſſential article of it, in total darkneſs? Hence, to confine ourſelves to Chriſt's own words, which is the only right way to do, we are neceſſitated to take this *everlaſting puniſhment*, to be puniſhment without end. Eſpecially as the whole body of Jews and chriſtians, we are certain, originally underſtood Chriſt in this manner; and Chriſt deſigned to be thus underſtood. But if we leave Dr. C. with his citations from the apoſtles, for him to try to prove the contrary; they only turn againſt himſelf; and further enforce what we are now contending for.

As a further argument that this *ſentence* upon the wicked muſt be taken literally, Chriſt, in this ſame account, dooms the wicked to *everlaſting fire*, prepared for the devil and his angels. The puniſhment of devils muſt be endleſs, becauſe they are left without a ſaviour. And becauſe no intimation is given, in

ſcripture,

ſcripture, of their redemption; but every thing to the contrary. The *ſerpent's* head is to be bruiſed, or cruſhed, &c. Therefore, the *curſed* from among men are left without a ſaviour, and left to remedileſs puniſhment; for they have the ſame doom with devils.

Dr. C. grants this *fire* may be ſtrictly everlaſting. He allows the wicked may, at the day of judgment, be ſent into fire which *never ſhall be quenched.** In the ſame place, he holds that the damned are not to be eternally in this endleſs fire. The fire may be endleſs, he ſays, but the damned are to be taken out of it, and taken to heaven. He had forgotten, it ſeems, that Chriſt, in this ſame diſcourſe, joins this *everlaſting fire* with *everlaſting puniſhment;* therefore makes them both one, as to duration. And if this ſame *everlaſting fire* is called, in another place, *fire which never ſhall be quenched*, this explains both the *fire* and the *puniſhment* as being endleſs; provided they need an explanation. But this, Dr. C's opinion, that the fire of hell may *never end*, though wicked men will certainly be taken out of it, is only adding one more to his tireſome ſcroll of contradictions. He had before ſaid, 'It is as great an abſurdity to ſuppoſe *fire* 'to be *ſtrictly* and *abſolutely eternal*, as to ſuppoſe the *earth*, 'or *mountains*, to be ſo. *Fire* naturally tends to an *end*. and 'will, in time, actually come to an *end;* and it is impoſſible, 'according to the eſtabliſhed laws of nature, but that it ſhould 'certainly do ſo.'† Thus, to perſuade ſinners not to be frightened at the *fire* of hell, in one place, he tells them it is impoſſible, in the nature of things, this *fire* ſhould continue without end. Again, he allows this *fire* may continue without end; but ſinners have little or nothing to fear from it; the damned, he aſſerts, will all be taken out of it, and as ſoon as ever they repent.

Becauſe the everlaſting puniſhment of the wicked, in the ſame verſe, is ſet over againſt the eternal or everlaſting life of the righteous, this is no reaſon, Dr. C. ſays, that the former ſhould be taken literally, although the latter muſt have a literal meaning. The former *everlaſting*, he ſays, is limited, but the latter unlimited; and becauſe the latter is unlimited, this is no reaſon why the former ſhould be ſo. The Doctor pretends to cite other texts, wherein *everlaſting* is twice uſed, in the ſame ſentence; and, as he ſays, 'in a different ſenſe.'‡ That is, once in the limited, and once in the unlimited, as in Rom. xvi. part of the 25th and part of the 26th verſes, and in Tit. i. 2. But his miſtaken notion of theſe texts has already been ſhown. See page 194. Trying to have the above paſſage, Matt. xxv. 46, agree with his ſcheme,

* P. 310, 311. † P. 273. ‡ P. 283.

ſcheme, Mr. Wincheſter alſo pretends to produce another, wherein *everlaſting*, occurs twice, in the ſame ſentence; and 'is applied,' he ſays, 'to two different things, whoſe exiſtence 'is not the ſame, or the time of their continuance not alike.'* As in Hab. iii. 6. 'He ſtood, and meaſured the earth: he beheld, 'and drove aſunder the nations; and the everlaſting mountains 'were ſcattered, the perpetual hills did bow: his ways are ev-'erlaſting.' God will forever manifeſt himſelf by his ways, it is granted; his ways alſo are everlaſting as to their effects. But, taken detachedly, his ways are in ſucceſſion, one after another. In this view, they are reſtricted to days or times. And, in this view, may be coupled with the hills or mountains; therefore, with them, may be figuratively called *everlaſting*. What ſeems to favour this conſtruction, the paſſage might as well be rendered, 'He ſtood, and the earth was meaſured: he beheld, and the 'nations were driven aſunder; the perpetual mountains were 'ſcattered, and the everlaſting hills did bow to his everlaſting 'ways.' But if, in every ſenſe, the ways of God be ſtrictly everlaſting, as Mr. W. argues, then the deſtruction or puniſhment of the Egyptians, Edomites, and Midianites will have no end. For of the ways of God, to their deſtruction, the prophet here ſpeaks.

There is no difficulty however, in allowing that *everlaſting* may be twice uſed, in the ſame ſentence, and in a diffierent ſenſe. Thus the words, 'Everlaſting God,' and 'everlaſting 'hills,' in a certain connection, may both be counted in one ſentence. So, the infinite ſtrength of God, and the infinite ſtrength of Nineveh, may both be mentioned in the ſame ſentence, as well as in the ſame bible. Theſe caſes are very plain. The ſtrength of Nineveh is an object *ſeen*, and well known, without the uſe of words; which cannot be ſaid of the God of Iſrael, or of the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. But, probably, enough has been ſaid to ſhow how words may be uſed different from their primitive meaning. It has alſo been made clear, perhaps, that unlimited terms, without any miſtake, may be figuratively applied to things temporal and finite, when theſe things are well known; which cannot be ſaid of things *unſeen* and unknown. But when the 'judge of all' ſays, 'Theſe 'ſhall go away into everlaſting puniſhment: but the righteous 'into life eternal,' this is carrying things into the unknown world. In this caſe, as nothing except the force of words can acquaint us with the nature of the ſubject; ſo unlimited terms muſt here have their literal meaning, unleſs there be expreſs notice

* P. 26.

tice to the contrary. But not a ſingle word has Chriſt ſaid, in deſcribing the laſt judgment, which abates the literal force of this doom to the wicked; any more than he has to curtail the reward to the righteous. And, as we have all reaſon to think, Chriſt meant to deſcribe the laſt judgment in the moſt plain unqueſtionable terms, ſuch as ſhould not need a particular explanation; ſo we are conſtrained to give a literal interpretation to this ſentence on the wicked. Therefore, if *everlaſting* is literally uſed any where in the bible, it certainly is in this inſtance.

6. This perfectly agrees with other things in ſcripture, related of the wicked. Rom. vi. 21, 22. 'For the end of thoſe things, '(the luſts of the fleſh) is death. But now being made free from 'ſin, and become ſervants to God, ye have your fruit unto holi-'neſs, and the end everlaſting life.' Here their end, whatever it be, is ſet in oppoſition to everlaſting life. The next verſe is, 'For the wages of ſin is death: but the gift of God is eternal 'life.' This death, the wages of ſin, runs parallel with eternal life. 2 Cor. xi. 15. 'His (ſatan's) miniſters transformed as 'the miniſters of righteouſneſs; whoſe end ſhall be according 'to their works.' Their end is their final ſtate, and being according to their works, they cannot be made happy, or be received to heaven; but muſt forever remain in hell. Phil. iii. 18, 19. 'The enemies of the croſs of Chriſt: whoſe end is 'deſtruction.' Heb. vi. 8. Hypocrites, falſe profeſſors, and apoſtates are compared to that vile ſort of ground that beareth thorns and briars, which is rejected, 'and is nigh unto curſing; 'whoſe end is to be burned.' Dr. C. allows that this *burning*, and this *deſtruction* is not annihilation; but a ſtate of complete torment. This, however, is a moſt pointed contradiction to his whole ſcheme. Which ſuppoſes the end, of the damned to be deliverance and ſalvation; for if they are all finally ſaved, their *end*, or laſt or final ſtate is ſalvation. But the Holy Ghoſt declares it to be *deſtruction*, *burning*, or complete torment. And as they are not annihilated, it can be no other than endleſs torment. For otherwiſe their *end*, would be annihilation. Hence, the threatened puniſhment to the wicked, and their final doom, has a *literal* meaning, inſtead of a *figurative* one.

The ſentence upon the blaſphemer againſt the Holy Ghoſt helps, at once, to decide both the original ſenſe of *theſe words*, as we have ſeen, and their application to the ſtate of the damned. 'It ſhall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in 'the world to come.' 'He hath never forgiveneſs, but is bound 'over to eternal damnation.' Chriſt, therefore, had prepared the

the way to let the world know his awful doom on the wicked, at the laſt day, is deciſive and unalterable. Eternal damnation he here explains to be a ſtate, where forgiveneſs *never* comes. The damned *ſhall never*, or not to *eternity*, as it is in the original, receive the leaſt benefit from Chriſt's death or purchaſe. And it is in vain to look for 'ſalvation in any other.'* It alſo proves vain and preſumptive to deny what Chriſt ſo plainly aſſerts. This example, concerning the blaſphemer againſt the Holy Ghoſt, has ſo accurately ſettled the original uſe of the word, it was impoſſible for Dr. C. to deny it, without going his whole length of abſurdity and contradiction. The *literal* uſe, therefore, of *theſe words* is not only decided, and decided as to the ſtate of the damned, but it is done in ſuch manner as all our arguments muſt yield to it. God has ſaid it. Chriſt has ſaid it. The judge of all has declared it. 'Theſe ſhall go away into everlaſting puniſhment;' into that woeful curſed ſtate where pardon *never* comes, and from which, of courſe, they *ſhall never* be releaſed. No arguments can give higher proof than ſuch plain aſſertions, from Chriſt himſelf. So we have here the higheſt poſſible evidence of the endleſs puniſhment of the damned. To argue againſt it is idle, and even daringly wicked. What does it avail to argue from the mercy of God, from his infinite overflowing benevolence, when he is the beſt interpreter of his own attributes, and of his own benevolence?

Thus far, my dear Sir, have we followed the univerſaliſts, in their tireſome round of inconſiſtencies. Whether all their cavils and objections have been fairly anſwered, and the meaning of the words we have been upon, ſettled, is now left with your candid judgment. One thing is certain. The ſubject before us is moſt ſolemn as well as intereſting. The very thought, beyond deſcription, is amazing and awful! Eternity, O eternity! eternity! We are ſwallowed up, we are loſt, in the contemplation. Our little minds ſhrink into nothing. God alone can ſurvey the boundleſs proſpect. But an eternity of *woe* or an eternity of *bliſs*, one or the other of theſe being our certain portion, is, in the beſt manner, ſuited to pierce the conſcience of the ſtupid ſinner, and to awaken and lead to repentance ſuch as *know not God*. The experience of ages is witneſs to this—Alſo, that this is beſt ſuited to the caſe of the believer, in his preſent fallible ſtate. So, on one hand, he is made to tremble, and fly from ſin, and eſcape for his life, like Lot fleeing out of Sodom. On the other to thirſt, long, & pant after that fulneſs of joy, where there are pleaſures forevermore.

I am &c.

* Acts 4. 12.

Univerſaliſm confounds and deſtroys itſelf, &c.

PART IV.

The ſufficiency of the *Atonement*, for the ſalvation of *all*, conſiſtent with the final deſtruction of *a part* of mankind. Alſo *the Second Death* explained.

LETTER I.

The Atonement makes proviſion for all men to be reconciled to God, and reconciliation to him explained.

My dear Friend,

THE ſufficiency of Chriſt's *atonement*, for the ſalvation of all men, appears to be a doctrine plainly taught in ſcripture. John i. 29. 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the 'ſin of the world!' In the original it is, *carrieth away*, or *beareth away*, the ſin of the world: having an alluſion, generally, to the lambs, bulls, and goats offered up by the Jews; alſo ſome particular alluſion to the ſcape-goat, on the great day of expiation, which bore away the ſins of the people into the wilderneſs. Here it is in the ſingular number, the *ſin* of the world: that is, being collectively taken. And muſt have reference to any one of the human race, as well as to another; alſo, to the whole, as well as to a part. Therefore, Chriſt, by his death, taketh away, or beareth away the ſin of the whole world.

The ſame thing we find, 1 John ii. 2. 'He is the propitiation 'for our ſins; and not for ours only, but alſo for the ſins of the 'whole world.' 2 Cor. v. 19. 'God was in Chriſt reconciling 'the world unto himſelf, not imputing their treſpaſſes unto them; 'and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.' Coloſ. i. 19, 20. 'For it pleaſed the Father that in him ſhould all ful-'neſs dwell; And, having made peace through the blood of his 'croſs, by him to reconcile all things unto himſelf; by him, I 'ſay, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.' Theſe paſſages, and other ſimilar ones, are clearly expreſſive of the ful-

neſs

neſs and ſufficiency of Chriſt's *atonement*. This leads to the following remarks.

1. *Atonement* and *reconciliation* are both one. Both mean the ſame thing, and both are tranſlated from the ſame original word. As in Rom. v. 10, 11. 'For if when we were enemies, 'we were *reconciled* to God by the death of his Son; much 'more, being *reconciled*, we ſhall be ſaved by his life. And not 'only ſo, but we alſo joy in God through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, 'by whom we have now received the *atonement*.' In the firſt of theſe verſes, it might have been, '*atoned* to God by the death 'of his Son,' inſtead of '*reconciled* to God by the death of his 'Son.' Or, allowing this firſt verſe to ſtand as it now is, then the laſt might as well have been, 'by whom we have now receiv-'ed the *reconciliation*.' So the Greek word is rendered in 2 Cor. v. 19. *Reconciliation* is, however, ſometimes tranſlated from the ſame Greek word as *propitiation* is; as in Heb. ii. 17, compared to 1 John ii. 2. Which ſhows that theſe three words, *atonement*, *reconciliation*, and *propitiation*, mean the ſame thing. Therefore,

2. Chriſt atoned, reconciled, or propitiated *all* things to God, by his death; 'whether they be things in earth, or things in hea-'ven;' whether angels, men, or devils; whether brutal or inanimate kind, even the whole creation. All this Chriſt reconciled or atoned to God. Or, rather Chriſt, by his death, purchaſed all things to himſelf. For him to uſe, according to his own holy pleaſure, in managing the great work of man's redemption.

This, inſtead of giving intimation of the redemption of devils, gives ſtrong intimation to the contrary; and that ſatan's head will be completely cruſhed. Should any, however, argue from hence the ſalvation of fallen angels, by the ſame rule they muſt argue that elect angels had need of the atoning blood of Chriſt, to ſecure their ſalvation. For the latter were atoned to God as well as the former. So were the brutal kind, and even all created things. Every one will grant that Chriſt did not purchaſe holy angels from miſery and death; they were not expoſed to it. So, neither did he purchaſe fallen angels from miſery and death, although they were ſentenced to it. Reconciliation to God, or purchaſing of God, made no eſſential change in the ſtate of holy angels; ſo, neither did it in the ſtate of wicked angels. The former cannot be denied; the latter, of courſe, muſt be admitted. This general ſenſe, therefore, of atoning, or reconciling all things to God, to avoid confuſion, muſt be conſidered as nothing more or leſs, than that Chriſt purchaſed them for his own uſe. But,

3. Chriſt,

3. Chriſt, by his death, *reconciled* the human race, in a peculiar and appropriate ſenſe. His atonement had that relation to the human race, which it had to no other creatures. Chriſt took upon him our nature. He entered into a near relation to us. He became man. He took the place of man, and of all human beings. That one offering, which Chriſt preſented to the Father, had reſpect to all mankind, to one as well as another. And that one offering took away or bore away the ſin of the world, of all men. So that Chriſt reconciled the human race to God, by taking away their ſin. Let us now examine how this is to be underſtood, according to ſcripture. And,

I. The ſin of the world is borne away, when juſtice is ſuſpended for them, or when the deſerved puniſhment is not inflicted on the world.

That juſtice is ſuſpended, or ſtayed, or held back, and that God ſhows mercy to all men, while they continue in this life, cannot be denied. Alſo, that this is the fruit of Chriſt's death, cannot be denied But while juſtice is ſuſpended or held back, ſin is taken away; the deſert of ſin is not inflicted. So when God did not conſume his people, *in a moment*, but ſuffered them to live, he then *pardoned* them. Moſes prayed to the LORD, and ſaid, 'Pardon, I beſeech thee, the iniquity of this people, 'according unto the greatneſs of thy mercy, and as thou haſt 'forgiven this people from Egypt even until now. And the 'LORD ſaid, I have pardoned according to thy word.' Numb. xiv. 19, 20. It is evident, from what connects with this paſſage, that a ſuſpenſion of the execution of ſtrict juſtice was one principal thing intended by this *pardon*. Again, when Aaron went into *the moſt holy place*, and returned alive, or did not die, this was a ſure token that *the moſt holy place* was reconciled, and God reconciled to the people. That is, God had not inflicted immediate death, neither upon the prieſt nor people; God had ſtayed his juſtice, and kept them alive, therefore he was reconciled to them.

II. While men are kept alive, a day of grace is allotted them. In this very important ſenſe, God is reconciled to all men, by giving them a day of grace and ſalvation, ſo long as they continue in this life.*

Divine providence is a ſtanding witneſs, that all men have their day of ſalvation. Acts xiv. 17. 'Nevertheleſs, he (God) 'left not himſelf without a witneſs, in that he did good, and 'gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful ſeaſons, filling our hearts 'with food and gladneſs.' As this was addreſſed to pagan idolaters, ſo it applies to them univerſally, as well as to Jews and Chriſtians.

* An exception is here underſtood, of ſuch as have committed the unpardonable ſin; theſe have had their day of grace.

Chriſtians. It undoubtedly applies to every child of Adam, in every period of time. Though God *in time paſt ſuffered all nations*, and ſtill ſuffers the moſt of them, to walk in their own ways, filling up the meaſure of their iniquity; yet he conſtantly gives, throughout the earth, tokens of his goodneſs—that he is kind or merciful to the unthankful and to the evil. This ſtanding witneſs of divine goodneſs and mercy gives all men, every where, ground of encouragement to fear God and work righteouſneſs; and to believe, and hope that the ſupreme cauſe *can*, at leaſt, ſhow mercy to men, both in this and the coming world. By terrible things in righteouſneſs, it is granted, the judge of the world has given reaſon to conclude, that the greateſt part of our race has hitherto been doomed to *perdition*; ſtill he has often made a diſtinction between the righteous and the wicked. Which leaves ground of encouragement to all men, to become righteous.

The apoſtle ſays of the whole body of heathen, 'That they 'are without excuſe,' becauſe they do not know God, and glorify him as God. Alſo, that they are without excuſe for their hatred, and cruelty, and all their abominable deeds towards each other. See Rom. i. This ſtrongly argues that they have opportunity, and are under ſacred obligation to fear God, and work righteouſneſs, or perform every act of juſtice and mercy to their fellow men. But, 'He that followeth after righteouſneſs and 'mercy findeth life, righteouſneſs, and honour.' Prov. xxi. 21. The *life* here mentioned, from many things in this book, means *eternal life*, this being the chief thing intended. The heathen have miſtaken every idea of *virtue*, or of righteouſneſs and mercy; but, as they 'are a law unto themſelves,' they have means and opportunity to know righteouſneſs and mercy, in their true ſenſe, and follow after them. Should they do this, then would they find, in the end, future and eternal bleſſedneſs. All men, therefore, not excepting the heathen, have a ſeaſon and day of grace; which is in conſequence of the death of Chriſt. 'God 'was in Chriſt, reconciling the world unto himſelf, not imput-'ing their treſpaſſes unto them.' Their treſpaſſes are taken out of the way, borne away, in ſuch manner, that all men are left free to purſue the path of peace, mercy and love; which ends in eternal life.

It is granted that the heathen, 'where there is no viſion,'* univerſally *periſh*. And will continue ſo to do, till the more powerful means of the goſpel are uſed among them. But this is no concluſive argument, that they have not a day of grace and ſalvation. If it is, why does the apoſtle cite them, to the means uſed

* Prov. 29. 18.

uſed with them, and the bleſſings beſtowed upon them? And why does he condemn them for abuſing the light they have?

By ſuch as embrace the goſpel, it has been generally agreed that the death of Chriſt has reſtored all mankind to a ſtate of probation, ſo for them to have their day of ſalvation. And that the whole body of heathen have ſufficient motives to do juſtly, love mercy, and walk humbly. Should they do this, and according to the light they have, the whole pagan world would ſoon become a paradiſe. Beſides, it is nothing but their pride, prejudice, or ſin which prevents the glorious light of the goſpel ſhining among them. Theſe things are generally agreed to, by ſuch as embrace revelation. Hence, Chriſt is the *propitiation* for the ſins of the whole world, in that important ſenſe which brings every one into a ſalvable ſtate.

III. One principal thing, and one of the moſt obvious things intended by Chriſt's *propitiation* and *reconciliation*, in the above paſſages, is, the bringing of the Gentiles into viſible covenant-relation with God; conſtituting them his viſible church; and committing to them his word and ordinances.

As the Moſaic rites on the 'day of atonement,'* reconciled the altar, the moſt holy place, the prieſt and the people, and all things to God; ſo the death of Chriſt reconciled the poor out-caſt Gentiles to God: That is, opened a door for the preaching of the goſpel among them, and for their becoming his viſible people. God did not exact ceremonial cleanſing, in order to their acceptance with him. He did not impute their treſpaſſes unto them, ſo as to require of them Moſaic rites. Neither were their treſpaſſes, though ever ſo great, a bar in the way of their return to God. Repentance of their ſins, and public profeſſion of their faith in Chriſt, was all which was requiſite to their admiſſion, as viſible members of his kingdom. Under the Jewiſh law, the painful rite of circumciſion was exacted, and a courſe of ceremonial cleanſing, before a Gentile could be reconciled, atoned, or admitted. The death of Chriſt rendered theſe things uſeleſs. The death of Chriſt cleanſed the whole world of pagans, ſtrangers, or aliens. That infinite ſacrifice Chriſt preſented to the Father, took away every ceremonial uncleanneſs, aboliſhed all diſtinction between Jew and Gentile, and, in this ſenſe, atoned the world to God.

But, it is remarkable that the way of reconciliation, or door opened for it, is ſpoken of as though the thing were already done, or the Gentiles already brought into the kingdom of the Redeemer. 'God was in Chriſt reconciling the world to himſelf, 'not imputing their treſpaſſes unto them; and hath committed 'unto

* Levit. xvi. xxiii.

'unto us the word of reconciliation.' The apoſtle directly adds, 'Now then we are embaſſadors for Chriſt, as though God did be-'ſeech you by us: we pray you in Chriſt's ſtead, be ye recon-'ciled to God.' He here prays them to be *reconciled*, and juſt before aſſerts that the world was or had been *reconciled*. The meaning is, by the death of Chriſt, God was pacified to the world, ſo as a door was open for the Gentiles, every where, to return unto him. And whenever they did return unto him, and profeſs their faith in Chriſt, they were then conſtituted viſible members of his kingdom.

In Rom. xi. 15. it is ſaid, 'If the caſting away of them (the 'Jews) be the reconciling of the world, what ſhall the receiv-'ing of them be, but life from the dead?' Here the Jews are put in oppoſition to *the world*; therefore *the world*, in this place, muſt mean the pagan nations in general. As in verſe 12, preceding, 'Now if the fall of them (the Jews) be the riches of 'the world, and the diminiſhing of them the riches of the Gen-'tiles, how much more their fulneſs?' Thus it is plain, in theſe places, *the Gentiles*, diſtinguiſhed from the Jews, and *the world*, are both one. But the caſting away of the Jews is the reconciling of the Gentiles. God took occaſion by this awful event, the rejection of the whole body of the Jews, from their viſible relationſhip to him, to reconcile or bring the Gentiles into the ſame viſible ſtanding. Although but a comparatively ſmall part of the pagan world was, or has been, gathered into Chriſt's church, yet the door was open for the whole, and a promiſe that the whole ſhould in due time be gathered in. And this is ſpoken of as though it were already done.

This event, the calling of the Gentiles from their horrid wretchedneſs and ſin, without any offering on their part, without money and without price, ſolely in conſequence of the death of Chriſt; and called to this dignified relation to God himſelf; this is often mentioned both in the old and new teſtament, as a moſt marvellous and glorious event. How many aſcriptions of praiſe and thankſgiving to God, how many ſongs of everlaſting joy have been ſung, on this occaſion?

Do we need further proof, that a viſible ſtanding in the church of God is *reconciliation* to him, the point is ſettled in Eph. ii. 16. 'That he (Chriſt) might reconcile *both* unto God in one bo-'dy by the croſs.' The words juſt before are, 'For to make in 'himſelf of *twain* one new man, ſo making peace.' The antecedent to theſe relatives, *twain* and *both*, are the *uncircumciſion* and the *circumciſion*, Jews and Gentiles; ſee verſe 11. Chriſt had made proviſion, 'by the croſs, to reconcile *both* theſe unto

'God

'God in one body,' or in one viſible church. The apoſtle ſays again, verſe 14, 'For he is our peace, who hath made both one, 'and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us:' alluding to the partition wall between the court of the Jews and the court of the Gentiles. When this wall was broken down, both parties were incorporated into one body, and both equally reconciled to God. Whoever attends to his bible, muſt be ſenſible there is, throughout, an external and viſible *reconciliation* ſpoken of, as well as that which is internal and ſpiritual. The Iſraelites, on the day they were numbered, were all of them, who were twenty years old and upwards, reconciled or ranſomed to God, by each man's paying his half ſhekle of ſilver. Exod. xxx. 11—16. It is plain that this was only outward or viſible; for certainly they were not all delivered from ſin, nor ranſomed from the dominion of ſatan. So when reconciliation was made for the holy ſanctuary, for the temple, for the altar, for the prieſt, for all the people of the congregation, and for all their ſins *once a year*;* this was to maintain their viſible ſtanding: the great body of them were, oftentimes, unreconciled in heart. And the church, made up of Jews and Gentiles, reconciled unto God in one body by the croſs, Chriſt ſaid of it, 'Then ſhall the king-'dom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, which took their 'lamps, and went forth to meet the bridegroom. And five of 'them were wiſe, and five were fooliſh.'†——Only a ſmall part of the world of mankind has been thus reconciled, or had a viſible ſtanding in the kingdom of the Redeemer. This, however, is not owing to ſome deficiency in the atonement. And that the atonement makes full proviſion for the whole race of Adam, for them all to enjoy a place and ſtanding in the church of God, here on earth, is evident from the following.

1. The goſpel is one general offer, for all men to take Chriſt's yoke upon them and learn of him, or become viſible members of his kingdom. This is one thing intended by the words, 'God 'was in Chriſt, reconciling the world unto himſelf, not imput-'ing their treſpaſſes unto them; and hath committed unto us the 'word of reconciliation.' The goſpel appears to have ſpoken one language from the beginning. Though Cain was driven out from the preſence of the LORD, that is, debarred viſible communion with the LORD's people; yet there appears nothing to debar his poſterity. It is evident from facts, that, all along down to Moſes' time, no one was ſhut out of the kingdom, excepting ſuch as voluntarily excluded themſelves, or were thruſt out for their own ſins. At Moſes' time, the ſeed of Iſrael was ſelected from

* Levit. 16. 33, 34 † Matt. 25. 1.

from all other nations, and had the preeminence above all others, as the choſen people of God. But, before this all other nations had openly rejected the true God, and joined themſelves to their idols. So they firſt cut themſelves off from viſible membership, in the kingdom of the Meſſiah. Proviſion was made, however, in the Moſaic law; the door was open for ſtrangers to come from any part of the earth, whoſoever would, and unite with the Jews, or become proſelytes to their religion.* The excluſion of a Moabite, an Ammonite, and others, in Deut. xxiii. who ſhould not enter into the congregation of the LORD, to the tenth generation, was an excluſion only from ſacred and civil offices. The congregation of the LORD there means the congregation of elders or rulers; which is the ſenſe generally given by Annotators. It is therefore generally agreed, and is plain from many things in ſcripture, that, from the beginning to Chriſt's time, and to the end of time, the door of the church is open for whoſoever will, to enter in and enjoy all the outward means of ſalvation. As Chriſt gives this general offer to the whole world, making no exception, it follows that he has made proviſion, and is able to grant what he offers. Certainly he offers nothing but what he is able to give, prvided men yield to his terms. Hence, the atonement makes full proviſion for all men to be viſibly reconciled to God.

2. We are commanded to pray for all men, that they might be gathered into his viſible kingdom. 'Thy kingdom come. 'Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.'† This is praying for all men over the whole earth, *in earth as in heaven*, that they might become viſible members and obedient ſubjects of this kingdom. Before Chriſt ſo expreſsly commanded it, even from the beginning, the church of God had a right, and were under obligation to pray for this event. This is clear from many things in the old teſtament. But if we are commanded thus to pray for all men, then has Chriſt's atonement removed every obſtacle, and opened the door for the gathering of all men into his kingdom.

The blaſphemer againſt the Holy Ghoſt has had his day of grace, and ſinned it away. For this character we are forbidden to pray, or not commanded to it. This implies, ſo ſcripture teaches, that the atonement makes no proviſion for his ſalvation; that is, after he has committed this ſin. But, as this is the only one, among men, excepted in our prayers, and becauſe no proviſion is made for him; it follows that proviſion is made for all others, for to allow them, whenever they truly deſire it, viſible membership in the church of God.

* See Exod. 12. 48, 49. Numb. 9. 14. and 15. 14—16. † Matt. 6. 10.

3. This agrees with the commiſſion given to the apoſtles 'Go ye, therefore, and teach or diſciple all nations.'——— 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the goſpel to every creature.'* It is an exceeding plain caſe, from fact and experience, that this literally applies to every child of Adam. The apoſtles and miniſters of Chriſt always conſider that no one is excepted in their commiſſion. Their buſineſs is, without exception, to diſciple and bring into viſible ſtanding *all nations*, and *whoſoever will*. Hence, the atonement makes ample proviſion for this end.

4. The ſame atonement which is ſufficient to reſtore one of our fallen race, into viſible relation with God, is ſufficient to reſtore the whole. Had God ſeen fit to have recovered only one of all our race, to covenant-relation with him, the ſame atonement would then have been neceſſary, as Chriſt has now made. Again, had he ſeen fit to have reſtored the whole of mankind, in this manner, no other atonement than what now is would have been needful. So, had God ſeen fit to have given eternal life to all men, or had he ſeen fit to have given it only to one man, in either caſe, the ſame atonement, and no other, would have been neceſſary. The atonement could not have been more full than what it now is. Neither could one leſs than what now is been accepted, as a ground for the pardon of ſin. As Chriſt is God, equal with the Father, ſo he offered up a ſacrifice infinitely meritorious. And no other could have been accepted.

Theſe things make it evident, that there is the ſame propriety in exhorting and encouraging all men, every where, to become viſible members of the church of Chriſt, and enjoy all the means of ſalvation, as there was to encourage angels in the early period of creation, to perſevere in holineſs. There appears ſufficient proviſion, and the ſtrongeſt motives, in one caſe as well as the other. All men are not viſibly reconciled to God: moſt of the nations and of the world have publickly rejected the goſpel, and refuſed to take Chriſt's yoke upon them. So, great part of the angels *kept not their firſt eſtate*, they ſinned and were rejected of God. But, the angels that *left their own habitation*, had the ſame opportunity, means and motives, to have continued in holineſs, as thoſe had that did continue. The privileges, means, motives, and opportunities for all the angels, one as well as another, appear no leſs or inſufficient, becauſe a part of them ſinned and are caſt off. And it was as free for thoſe that fell, to have remaind holy, as it was for thoſe that did thus remain. This cannot be denied. So all the bleſſings of the goſpel are as free for thoſe who reject them, as for thoſe who embrace them. And no

* Matt. 28. 19. Mark 16. 15.

no objection can ariſe againſt the fulneſs of the atonement, becauſe only part of mankind are benefitted by it, ſo as to enjoy all the means of ſalvation, any more than there could againſt the conſtitution under which angels were placed, becauſe only part of them were eventually benefitted by it. Many of the angels loſt their heaven, when it was free for them to have retained it. Many among men are ſunk in pagan darkneſs, when it is free for them to enjoy the light of the goſpel. The rebel angels were ſhut out of heaven wholly by their own ſin. It is nothing but their own ſin which holds the heathen world in darkneſs, and ſhuts them out from the goſpel.

And ſuch as neglect or deſpiſe a viſible ſtanding in the church of God, who have the bible at the ſame time in their hands and the light of Chriſt ſhining around them; they in a very ſtriking manner declare their own ſin.—'We will not have this man to 'reign over us.'* This matter is alſo very ſtrikingly ſet forth in Matt. xxii.———'Behold, I have prepared my dinner: my 'oxen and my fatlings are killed, and all things are ready: come 'unto the marriage. But they made light of it, and went their 'ways, one to his farm, another to his merchandiſe.' Now, ſhall it be ſaid of this 'certain king,' mentioned in this parable, that he has not made full proviſion for the feaſt, for the marriage of his ſon, unleſs all invited do actually come in and partake? Becauſe ſome deſpiſe his invitation, does this argue that the *dinner* is not *prepared*, and *all things ready?* does this leſſen the proviſion of the feaſt?—Therefore, as ſome of the angels declared their own ſin, by deſpiſing that eternal fulneſs of happineſs and glory, prepared for them in heaven, ſo ſome men, yea many men declare their own ſin, by deſpiſing that fulneſs and richneſs of grace, offered to their enjoyment, in the viſible kingdom of the Redeemer.

Thus far we have the ſufficiency of the atonement: thus far the world is reconciled or atoned to God. Juſtice is ſuſpended and a day of grace is alloted to all men: The way is open for all to be brought into viſible covenant-relation with God: The way is open for all men, every where, to enjoy all the diſtinguiſhed privileges and means of ſalvation. This directly ſhows the miſtake of univerſaliſts. All men are actually reconciled to God, by the atonement, in the ſenſe here ſtated, and a very important reconciliation it is; yet theſe outward means, and offers of ſalvation, without ſomething further, never will bring one of our fallen race to eternal ſalvation. Not only ſo, men may indeed be brought into covenant with God, outwardly ſuch, and have

* Luke 19 14.

have a ſtanding in his church, and yet be no more fitted for heaven than the vileſt among the heathen. This is evident from facts. Hence, the fruits of the atonement muſt extend further than merely to make offers of ſalvation, with every outward mean and privilege, otherwiſe none among men will be ſaved. Which leads to obſerve,

IV. God muſt give his holy Spirit to renew and ſanctify the heart. The heart muſt be reconciled to God, before man can be ſaved. To fit man for heaven, God muſt give a new heart, and a right ſpirit, and take away the heart of ſtone. Until this great work is done, men univerſally reject the offers of ſalvation.—'They all with one conſent began to make excuſe.' Luke xiv. 18. But Chriſt has died for this end, to ſend the holy ſpirit; whoſe office is to enlighten the mind, and give *a new ſpirit*. Chriſt is riſen from the dead, and 'exalted, to give repentance.' Acts v. 31. 'Unto you it is given in the behalf of Chriſt—to 'believe on him.' Phil. i. 29. 'To them that have obtained like 'precious faith with us through the righteouſneſs of God and 'our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.' 2 Pet. i. 1.

But the atonement makes proviſion for the whole human race, ſo that God could, by his ſpirit, ſanctify the heart of each one, and complete their ſalvation. God could do this provided it were beſt for the univerſe. The atonement makes ſuch ample proviſion for all men, without exception, that there is no bar in the way, neither would juſtice be overlooked, or made to ſuffer, even were they all renewed and ſaved. But the queſtion is, whether divine juſtice would then be diſplayed to the higheſt degree, or in the beſt manner; or whether every good end would then be anſwered, the ſame as tho' part of mankind were made forever miſerable. Again, whether God has revealed that all ſhall be ſaved.

There can be no queſtion as to the full proviſion made by the death of Chriſt. And if this reſtores the whole human race to a ſtate of probation, opens a door of mercy for all, and gives opportunity for all to be viſibly reconciled to God, as has been ſhown; ſo it makes proviſion for God, if he ſees it beſt, to give his holy ſpirit to all, and renew their hearts, and make them heirs of ſalvation. The above arguments in favour of the former equally apply to the latter. If all the outward means of grace are freely offered, in the goſpel, to every creature, ſo is the gift of the holy ſpirit. Nothing is plainer than the free gift of the holy ſpirit, offered in the goſpel to every creature. Then does the atonement make proviſion for God to give his ſpirit to every one,

one, or to whomſoever he will. We are alſo commanded to pray that God would '*pour out his ſpirit upon all fleſh.*'* It is undoubtedly a fact that every one of the human race, that has hitherto lived, or will yet live, has been, or will be, a ſubject of prayer for this end; that God would beſtow on him the ſpirit of grace, for his ſanctification and redemption. The deciſion of the event is left with infinite wiſdom. But if prayer is made for all, to this end, then is proviſion made for all, by the atonement. God therefore can do his ſovereign pleaſure, and there is no obſtacle in the way; he can ſanctify and ſave part of mankind, or the whole of them, juſt as wiſdom directs. Again, if the atonement is ſufficient for God to give a ſpirit of grace and ſanctification to one, it is then ſufficient for God to do the ſame for the whole of Adam's race. Becauſe the atonement could neither have been greater, nor leſs, than what it now is, as has been already ſhown. The atonement is alſo one general ſacrifice or offering, having reſpect to all mankind alike, or to one as well as another. And when it is ſaid, 'In that night there ſhall be 'two men in one bed; the one ſhall be taken, and the other ſhall 'be left. Two women ſhall be grinding together; the one ſhall 'be taken, and the other left. Two men ſhall be in the field; 'the one ſhall be taken, and the other left;'† It is not any thing in the atonement that makes this difference between one and another. The atonement prepares the way ſo as God can act as a ſovereign, in taking one and leaving another, making one a veſſel of wrath and another a veſſel of mercy. Or, in conſequence of the death of Chriſt, God can ſanctify and ſave a part, or the whole of mankind, juſt as his wiſdom directs, or as the higheſt good of the univerſe requires. In what way this higheſt good will be effected, revelation muſt determine. Here we are told, 'many be called, but few choſen.'—'Wide is the gate, and 'broad is the way, that leadeth to deſtruction, and many there be 'which go in thereat.'‡ Though theſe ſolemn and awful words have hitherto applied, yet the happy *millennium*, as we hope, will reverſe the ſcene. In that glorious day, we have reaſon to conclude that God will, literally, *pour out his ſpirit upon all fleſh.* The Jews, with the *fulneſs* of the Gentiles, will then 'come in. 'And ſo all Iſrael will be ſaved.'§ The ten tribes, and the inhabitants of the whole earth, who will then be alive on the earth, will be ſaved: making the ſpiritual ſeed of Abraham as *the duſt of the earth* for multitude.‖ But

* Acts 2. 17. † Luke 17. 34, 35, 36. ‡ Matt. 7. 13. and 20. 16. § Rom. 11. 25, 26.

‖ In the days of the *millennium*, every thing will have a natural tendency to a vaſt increaſe of population. Inſtead of war, plunder, and rapine, there will be peace, harmony, and the beſt order. Inſtead of famine and peſtilence, there will be health and plenty

But the caſe of angels again ſerves to illuſtrate the caſe before us. And God could have communicated his ſpirit to them that fell, as well as he did to them that remained holy. God could have ſecured all the angels in holineſs and happineſs, as well as to have ſecured only part of them, in the manner he did. There was no obſtacle in the way, neither would divine juſtice, or the divine character in any ſenſe, have ſuffered, had God ſecured the whole body of the angels in eternal happineſs. But wiſdom did not direct to this, or certainly God would have done it. And had God done this for the whole of the angels, and for all his rational creatures, the queſtion is, whether divine juſtice, tho' not injured, or made to ſuffer, would not then have been almoſt, if not wholly concealed, or not revealed? Whereas the juſtice of God now, in the execution of it upon apoſtate angels, appears in its real beauty and glory. So it muſt be granted that the atonement placed all men completely within the reach of ſalvation. And God could have ſecured the eternal happineſs of each one, by communicating his holy ſpirit to them, and preparing them for this happineſs; certainly God could have done this for all men, as well as he could have ſecured all the angels. There appears nothing in the way, in one caſe, any more than in the other. There likewiſe appears nothing in the way, ſince the death of Chriſt, to bar the ſalvation of all men, any more than there

plenty. The things which now lay the earth waſte of inhabitants, will then be ſucceeded by ſuch as naturally tend to repleniſh it.——'When God firſt made mankind, he ſaid to them, 'Be fruitful, and multiply, and repleniſh, (or fill) the earth, and ſubdue it.' Gen. i. 28. And he renewed this command to Noah and his ſons, after the flood, and in them to mankind in general. Gen. ix. 1. This command has never yet been obeyed by mankind; they have yet done but little, compared to what they ought to have done, in ſubduing and filling the earth. Inſtead of this, they have ſpent great part of their time and ſtrength in ſubduing and deſtroying each other. But when the *millennium* ſhall begin, the inhabitants which ſhall then be on the earth, will be diſpoſed to obey the divine command, to ſubdue the earth, and multiply, until they have filled it; and they will have ſkill, and be under all deſirable advantages to do it; and the earth will be ſoon repleniſhed with inhabitants, and be brought to a ſtate of high cultivation and improvement, in every part of it; and will bring forth abundantly for the full ſupply of all; and there will be many thouſand times more people than ever exiſted before at once in the world. Then the following prophecy, which relates to that day ſhall be fulfilled: 'A little one ſhall become a thouſand, and a ſmall one a ſtrong nation: I the Lord will haſten it in his time.' Iſai. lx. 22. And there is reaſon to think the earth will be then, in ſome degree, enlarged in more ways than can now be mentioned, or thought of. In many thouſands, hundreds of thouſands, yea, millions of inſtances, large tracts now covered with water, coves and arms of the ſea, may be drained, or the water ſhut out by banks and walls; ſo that hundreds of millions of perſons may live on thoſe places, and be ſuſtained by the produce of them, which are now overflowed with water.—Who can doubt of this, who recollects how many millions of people now inhabit Holland and the Low Countries, the greateſt part of which was once covered with the ſea, or thought not to be capable of improvement.' *Dr. Hopkins' Treatiſe on the Millennium*, p. 74.

there was the happineſs of Adam, in the beginning. But had God, in conſequence of the Meſſiah, determined the ſalvation of all men, the queſtion is, whether divine juſtice would not then in a great meaſure lain concealed; compared to what it will in the endleſs perdition of part of our race?—To this it will be objected, that divine juſtice was ſo clearly revealed and vindicated, by the death of Chriſt, as to anſwer all the ends of ſuffering, or of puniſhment, inflicted on men. Neither can the endleſs puniſhment of mankind, any part of them, be of any uſe now, further to illuſtrate divine juſtice. This is Dr. Huntington's ſentiment. Its inconſiſtency we have ſeen, and may again ſee, in the next Letter.

If it is proper, however, to call any conſtitution complete, which God has formed for his rational creatures, ſo it is the conſtitution of grace, under which all men are placed. Every thing neceſſary for their ſalvation is as free as it was for the ſecurity of angels. Was it free for all the angels to remain in a juſtified ſtate, by virtue of their own works? It is no leſs free for all men to receive the pardon of their ſins, as the gift of grace. Was it free for all the angels to perſevere in holineſs, and while they were entirely under the influence and agency of the holy ſpirit? It is no leſs free for all men to receive the holy ſpirit, as their ſanctifier. Were all the angels, one as well as another, wholly dependent on the agency of the ſpirit, for their holineſs of heart? All men are equally dependent, and not more ſo, on the ſame ſpirit; and without the immediate influence and agency of the ſpirit, men can have not one holy thought; which was and ever will be the ſame with angels. Was it a privilege and bleſſing, the greateſt poſſible, inſtead of a burden or an evil, for the angels to be abſolutely dependent on the holy ſpirit, for their holy exerciſes of heart; ſo for them to have immediate and conſtant communion and converſe with God? This is no leſs a privilege and bleſſing offered to all men, inſtead of an evil or a burden.

Thus far the fulneſs and richneſs of the atonement. Which ſhows the aggravated guilt of ſuch as ſin againſt this grace, and reject this great ſalvation. Their guilt is vaſtly greater than any other, of all God's rational creatures. For they have vaſtly greater light than even the angels in heaven had, before they ſinned. Since that, has been the awful doom of devils. Since that, has been the awful doom of many wicked men. Since that, God has indeed ſhown, or acted, his unalterable hatred to ſin, his determination to avenge his juſtice, and that he will by *no means clear the guilty*: ſuch guilty men as live and die deſ-

piſing

piſing his grace. Amidſt all this light, hell uncovered to their view, and even in a view of the love and pity of a dying Saviour, ſinners ſin againſt heaven, and reject immortal life. How exceedingly aggravated is their guilt!

V. The atonement is called, in ſcripture, *a ranſom*, and *a price*.—'Who gave himſelf *a ranſom* for all, to be teſtified in 'due time.'*—'For ye are bought with *a price*.'†

It is conſiſtent that a price ſhould be paid, or an acknowledgment made, by one party, before the other will, or can, with honour, enter upon a treaty, or propoſe terms of reconciliation. This is ſometimes the caſe among men. Eſpecially, when a contention exiſts between the chief magiſtrate and a number of his rebellious ſubjects, he may require of theſe rebels that they firſt make a ſacrifice of their leaders, or pay a price, or make ſome acknowledgment to government, before he will enter upon any terms of accommodation. So the caſe between God and men, their offence being ſuch as God could not, conſiſtently with his honour, have made offers of peace to them, till a price was paid, a due acknowledgment made to his holy law or to his juſtice. But it was impoſſible for man, or all mankind together, to make ſuch acknowledgment, or pay ſuch a price, as would fully honour the law, and ſecure divine juſtice; unleſs they all took the curſe upon them, and ſuffered eternal death. Loſt men had nothing they could pay, ſo to lay a good foundation for their reconciliation to God. Hence their need of a mediator. And he muſt firſt pay the price, or make ſuch ſacrifice as to anſwer the demands of juſtice, in this caſe. The mediator muſt lay down his life, as the only price he can pay, for to make ſatisfaction. When this is done, the obſtacle is removed. When this is done, a foundation is laid for God to treat with loſt men, and propoſe his own terms of reconciliation. Furthermore, when this is done, all men are reſtored to a moſt deſirable ſtate of probation, having all the offers and means of ſalvation. On certain conditions, and on the wiſeſt and beſt conditions, every thing is offered to effect and complete their eternal happineſs.

Now, this is evidently the ſcheme of the goſpel. The atonement, or the price paid, is in order to open the way, for God to make offers and conditions with rebellious men. Offers and conditions to men, and to men as ſinners, are exceeding plain throughout the bible. The atonement therefore, does not finiſh the bargain, the covenant, or treaty between God and men, in ſuch manner as their ſalvation is completed, without any thing further being done. If it did, it would wholly ſet aſide the propriety

* 1 Tim. 2. 6 † 1 Cor. 6. 20.

priety of offers, and conditions propoſed to men. Why ſhould men be required to *believe*, ſo as to be ſaved, when their ſalvation is already certain? Why the threatening, 'He that believeth not ſhall be damned,'* when all men are indeed ſecured from damnation? Hence this price is primarily intended to open a door of ſalvation for ruined men. In this ſenſe it is a price or ranſom for all men, one as well as another. Which leads our attention to the following things.

1. This ranſom or price makes proviſion for God to *pour out* his ſpirit upon whom he will: upon a part or the whole of mankind, as wiſdom ſhall direct. For it is a given point, throughout ſcripture, that God has *mercy on whom he will*, and *whom he will* he hardeneth.

2. Unleſs God creates the heart anew, from ſin to holineſs, none will be ſaved. For without this great work is done in the heart, men univerſally *neglect* ſalvation. For God therefore to communicate a ſpirit of ſanctification, and do it for whom he will, is one main thing provided for by this price, or by the atonement.

3. This price is the procuring cauſe, or the meritorious cauſe of all the bleſſings beſtowed on men. Eſpecially it is the purchaſe of all the bleſſings beſtowed on the redeemed. The love of God, we know, is the firſt cauſe of all good to creatures. But the atonement is the purchaſe of this love, to ſinners; that is, it opens an honourable way for God to ſhow his love to his enemies.

4. The redeemed are ſpecially the purchaſe of Chriſt's blood. The whole of mankind are purchaſed by Chriſt. Chriſt bought them off from the immediate execution of juſtice, and gave them a day of grace. Such as have the goſpel, are in a higher ſenſe purchaſed, to enjoy the light thereof. Such as have a viſible ſtanding in the church, are in a ſtill higher ſenſe the purchaſe of Chriſt's blood, that they might enjoy viſible relationſhip to God, with the outward privileges. But believers in Chriſt are ſpecially purchaſed by his blood. This price or this blood is actually applied to them for the pardon of their ſins, and for their acceptance with God the Father. Not only ſo, believers are purchaſed in a two-fold ſenſe: by the ſacrifice of Chriſt's blood, an infinite price, for their juſtification: and the actual beſtowment of the holy ſpirit, another infinite price, for their ſanctification. For unbelievers, ſuch as periſh eternally, the ſame price is given as to the purchaſe of the offers and freeneſs of ſalvation. The ſame price is given for God to offer his holy ſpirit, the wa-

* Mark 16. 16.

ter of life, to them that periſh as to them that are actually ſaved; and ſalvation is as free to one as the other. But as all men, naturally, refuſe life and reſiſt the ſanctifying power of the ſpirit, divine wiſdom muſt decide who ſhall *be taken* and who ſhall *be left;* as in the caſe of the angels that fell and thoſe that remained holy. As men univerſally *refuſe and rebel*, it is by ſovreign grace, grace not previouſly ſought after, that the believer is made *willing*, contrary to his own corrupt will. That is, the grace of God, as the firſt and effectual cauſe, conquers, ſubdues, and removes his corrupt will, and implants in him an holy, benevolent will. Such are called, 'A choſen generation, 'a royal prieſthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people (or *pur-* '*chaſed* people); that they ſhould ſhow forth the praiſes of him 'who hath called them out of darkneſs into his marvellous light.'*

5. Why the ſalvation of believers is wholly by the merits of Chriſt, wholly his purchaſe and by the price of his blood; at the ſame time, their ſalvation wholly of grace; is now eaſily explained. The atonement purchaſes all this grace to believers. Or it is by the atonement only that grace is harmonious with juſtice. The love of God is unchangeably the ſame; the atonement can neither add to nor diminiſh from this love. For the honourable exerciſe of his grace, however, God ſaw it beſt that due acknowledgment ſhould be paid to his juſtice. That the world might ſee the curſe of his law to be holy and juſt, no more than equal to the evil of ſin. The atonement, therefore, is the price to open the way for the exerciſe of grace, conſiſtently with God's hatred to ſin. And reſpect being conſtantly had to the atonement, in every act of his grace to believers, is a conſtant declaration of his hatred to ſin, as well as his readineſs to forgive ſin. Hence, the righteouſneſs of Chriſt ſo often occurs in ſcripture, as well as the grace of God, in behalf of the redeemed.

6. The price Chriſt lays down, by ſhedding his blood, does not leſſen the debt ſinners owe to divine juſtice. It is not poſſible in the nature of things for this debt to be leſſened; or it is impoſſible for the ill deſert of ſin to be abated. The puniſhment due to ſinners, for their ſins, may be leſſened, or may be wholly remitted. But their deſert of puniſhment muſt forever remain the ſame. The evil nature of ſin is forever the ſame. The ſins once committed by David, Peter, or Paul, are ſtill the ſame ſins, and deſerving the ſame puniſhment; though theſe holy men have long been forgiven, and their deſerved puniſhment wholly ſet aſide. As God has an unchangeable hatred to ſin, ſo ſin, and all ſins are forever the ſame, in his view, and deſerving the ſame puniſhment.

* 1 Pet. 2. 9.

puniſhment. Therefore, the debt ſinful men owe divine juſtice, or their ill deſert, cannot, nor could not poſſibly be leſſened by the atonement. When men are forgiven it is a complete forgiveneſs, to the full amount of their ill deſert. Forgiveneſs is alſo wholly for Chriſt's ſake. His righteouſneſs alone makes it conſiſtent with juſtice for God to forgive ſin.

7. The price Chriſt lays down by his death declares divine hatred to ſin. This was the neceſſity and intent of the atonement, that the holy diſpleaſure of God towards ſin might be declared to the world. Chriſt was made *an offering for ſin, he was made a curſe. It pleaſed* the Father *to bruiſe him*, and *put him to grief;* to *awake his ſword againſt him*, and take away his life.* Now, if theſe moſt painful ſufferings, laid on the Son by the Father, did not expreſs divine anger againſt ſin, what elſe could they expreſs? It is certain that all the evils ſuffered by mere men, are expreſſive of divine anger towards ſin. Accordingly, the pain and death endured by Chriſt, muſt be expreſſive of the ſame. Chriſt ſuffered in the room of ſinful men. He '*ſuffered for ſins, the juſt for the unjuſt.*'† So it muſt be to expreſs divine anger againſt the ſins of ſinful men. Accordingly, the atonement ſpeaks the feelings of God's heart, declares to the world his holy hatred to ſin. And this is the ſame as to *magnify the law*, and *make it honourable.* This, again, makes the ſin of men appear more ſinful, inſtead of leſſening their guilt and ill deſert.—'God ſending his own ſon in the likeneſs 'of ſinful fleſh, and for ſin, condemned ſin in the fleſh.'‡ To condemn ſin is to make its ſinfulneſs appear.

8. This price paid by Chriſt, is not the ſame in each reſpect as when a man pays his debt to his creditor, or his neighbour pays it for him, in gold or ſilver. In this caſe the debtor ſtands even with the creditor, without any act of grace, or any thing given in, by the latter. But no price, no ranſom, no atonement can poſſibly reconcile ſinful men to God, without the interpoſition of grace. The reaſon is, the evil and ill deſert of ſin can no more be leſſened than God himſelf can change. We ſhall ſee more to this point in a following Letter, on the *infinite evil* of ſin. The atonement, however, is truly *a price* paid. It purchaſes the way, makes the way honourable, for the manifeſtation of grace. It is remarkable, notwithſtanding, that one ſingle term does not exhauſt this ſubject. The death of Chriſt is called *an offering, a ſacrifice, a ranſom, a price, a reconciliation, a propitiation*, and *an atonement.* Therefore, is not to be compared, in each reſpect, to what exiſts between one man and another. Furthermore,

* Iſai. 53. 10. Zech. 13. 7. Gal. 3. 13. † 1 Pet. 3. 18. ‡ Rom. 8. 3.

Furthermore, the coming of Chriſt into the world, his life and death, and every thing he does, are acts of grace to men. And when the father gives his ſon to be incarnate, and to die, this is grace, wonderful grace to men. Every thing which is done by the father, ſon, and ſpirit, for the ſalvation of men, is grace, *the manifold grace of God*——The obedience and death of Chriſt is called his *righteouſneſs*. And ſo called, becauſe whatever Chriſt does and ſuffers in the fleſh has ſpecial regard to law and juſtice; making ſatisfaction thereto, ſo as for opening a door of mercy. But this righteouſneſs of Chriſt is indeed grace to men. With the utmoſt propriety, therefore, ſalvation is ſaid to be wholly of grace, and wholly by the righteouſneſs of Chriſt.

Theſe things ſuggeſt a ſerious queſtion. As, in the words of the wiſe man, 'Wherefore is there a price in the hand of a fool 'to get wiſdom, ſeeing he hath no heart to it?' This queſtion involves a deep myſtery. Wherefore is a price put into the hand of a wicked man? Why has he ſuch a rich opportunity to get wiſdom? And why do ſo many live, for days and years, at laſt die, having no heart to improve their ſeaſon of grace? The apoſtle unfolds this myſtery. 'What if God, willing to ſhow 'his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much 'long ſuffering the veſſels of wrath fitted to deſtruction: and that 'he might make known the riches of his glory on the veſſels of 'mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory?'

VI. It may be of uſe as to our main object, to give ſome further account of the work of grace, by which the heart of man is reconciled to God; and anſwer objections as we paſs along.

This will firſt ſhow us man's heart in its native colors;—'full 'of evil, fully ſet to do evil, every imagination of the thoughts 'of his heart only evil continually;' yea, his 'heart is deceitful 'above all things, and deſperately wicked.'* Thus ſcripture aſſerts, not merely of ſome, the moſt remarkable for wickedneſs. But this is given as a general character, applicable to every unrenewed man; as any one may ſee, by examining the texts noted below. Now, it is not here ſaid that man's reaſon and conſcience is *full* of evil, and *only* evil *continually*. This would quite alter the caſe. But it is the heart, the only ſeat of moral action. There is neither love nor hatred, ſin nor holineſs, except in the heart. The heart of man being *full of evil, fully ſet to do evil, only evil continually*, it is therefore totally depraved in a moral ſenſe—totally ſinful. If, however, we want ſcripture to interpret itſelf, we are told, Rom. viii. 7, 8. 'The carnal mind is en-'mity againſt God: for it is not ſubject to the law of God, nei-'ther indeed can be. So then they that are in the fleſh cannot 'pleaſe

* Eccl. 9. 3. and 8. 11. Gen. 6. 5. Jerem. 17. 9.

'pleaſe God.' *Eternity* is not only expreſſive of the heart, but is the ſtrongeſt expreſſion of hatred. Some have a greater ſtrength of hatred than others. But the loweſt degree in this caſe, is real hatred or enmity againſt God and his law, or againſt God and man. This enmity often paſſes for friendſhip, becauſe the heart is deceitful above all things. But this is *alſo given* in a general ſenſe, and applied to every *carnal mind;* that is, to all ſuch as are not renewed by the Spirit of God. The deſign of the apoſtle is here to ſhow the difference between them that are *in the fleſh*, and them that are *in the ſpirit*. Them that are in the ſpirit, he ſays, they are led by the ſpirit of God, and are the ſons of God; but them that are in the fleſh, *are none of his*,* have no intereſt in Chriſt. Which ſhows the *carnal mind*, in this place, to be, not one that is in a meaſure carnal, and in a meaſure ſpiritual; or ſometimes carnal and ſometimes ſpiritual. But the carnal mind is one, and every one that is wholly carnal, and conſtantly ſo; having never received the ſpirit of Chriſt, neither has *part* nor *lot* with him. The carnal mind belongs to all carnal men. Which general uſe of the term muſt apply to all men by nature, to all ſuch as are not *born again*. Therefore, all men *by nature*, as they all have this *carnal mind*, have this enmity againſt God and their neighbour. Therefore, to let ſcripture interpret itſelf, all men by nature are *full of enmity, fully ſet to enmity, only enmity* againſt God and their fellow mortals, and that *continually*. If this does not expreſs the total depravity or ſinfulneſs of the natural heart, it is impoſſible to expreſs it by words. Beſides, as the leaſt ſpark of moral virtue does always pleaſe God, to plead for the leaſt ſpark of moral virtue in the heart of the natural man, is a direct contradiction of the above words, 'So then they that are in the fleſh cannot pleaſe God.'

Again, in this Epiſtle to the Romans, the apoſtle, deſignedly and expreſsly, gives the character of the whole human race, as they are in their natural ſtate.—'Being *filled* with all unrighteouſneſs, fornication, wickedneſs, covetouſneſs, maliciouſneſs: '*full* of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whiſperers, 'backbiters, haters of God, deſpiteful, proud, boaſters, inventors of evil things, diſobedient to parents, without underſtanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, 'unmerciful.'† This is given as the character and conduct of the whole heathen world, for the ſpace of two thouſand years, and indeed for all future ages of heatheniſm. And given in the moſt decided manner. But this is nothing peculiar to heathen and barbarians. Refering to them, the apoſtle ſays in the ſame connection,

* Verſes 9, 14. † Ch. 1. 29, 30, 31.

connection, 'Are we better than they? No, in no wiſe: for we 'have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all 'under ſin; As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not 'one: There is none that underſtandeth, there is none that ſeek-'eth after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are to-'gether become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, 'not one.'* The apoſtle cannot here intend ſome diſtinct claſs or ſet of men only, of whom 'there is none righteous, no, not 'one.' He intimates no ſuch thing. Neither can he intend the generation then preſent, to the excluſion of all the reſt of mankind; and that of this generation only, there is none righteous, no, not one. For the ſame might be ſaid of all paſt generations. His words are very plain. 'What then? Are we better than 'they,' are we better than the ungodly heathen? 'No, in no 'wiſe: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that 'they are all under ſin; As it is written,' &c. Theſe laſt words, 'As it is written,' refer back to what was written in paſt ages, concerning man's character. He then goes on to ſtate what was written; and quotes out of Pſal. xiv, and liii, and ſeveral others. It is there written, 'There is none that ſeeketh after God, there 'is none that doeth good, no, not one.' Which looks back to paſt ages as well as the preſent; and therefore muſt give the exact character of man in all ages.

There are but two interpretations remaining, of theſe words of the apoſtle, which can even be thought of. The firſt is, 'There 'is none righteous, no, not one,' in a comparitive ſenſe. That is, none ſo righteous as they ought to be; or none wholly free from ſin and perfectly holy. The ſecond is, That all men by nature, not one excepted, are totally ſinful. To hold to the firſt interpretation, to the excluſion of the ſecond, cannot be right. For, to ſay that all which is meant in this paragraph, is, that there is not one ſo righteous as he ought to be, or not one perfectly holy; and that this is the excluſive ſenſe of ſcripture throughout; goes directly to break down all diſtinction between ſaints and ſinners. Which is enough, were there nothing elſe, to make us reject this interpretation. This interpretation alſo diſagrees with the general ſenſe of ſcripture. And, if we come to particulars, it diſagrees with what the apoſtle ſays of himſelf, and with the words he quotes out of the Pſalms, and illy ſuits the occaſion and deſign of his introducing theſe words. All which we ſhall preſently ſee.

This interpretation therefore muſt of neceſſity be rejected, and the ſecond adopted. And this agrees and harmonizes with all thoſe

* Ch. 3. 9—12.

thoſe things with which the other diſagrees. Scripture generally and variouſly and abundantly teaches the total ſinfulneſs of all men by nature, this we have already ſeen. The apoſtle ſays of himſelf, 'I know that in me, that is in my fleſh, dwelleth no good 'thing.'* Theſe words, 'no good thing,' mean poſitive evil, nothing but moral evil or ſin; and the words, 'in my fleſh,' being added, determine what he is by nature—altogether ſinful. This he ſays of himſelf, as is evident from the connection of theſe words. The words of Pſal. xiv th, which the apoſtle quotes, as mentioned above, are, 'The fool hath ſaid in his heart, There is 'no God. They are corrupt, they have done abominable works, 'there is none that doeth good. The LORD looked down from 'heaven upon the children of men, to ſee if there were any that 'did underſtand, and ſeek God. They are all gone aſide, they 'are all together become filthy: there is none that doeth good, 'no, not one.' In this place, 'fool' intends a general character, it being directly changed from the ſingular to the plural number, therefore muſt intend men in general. 'The fool' alſo means the natural man, and all natural men. As in 1 Cor. ii. 14. 'The 'natural man receiveth not the things of the ſpirit of God; for 'they are fooliſhneſs unto him.' 'The fool hath ſaid in his heart, 'No God.' Natural men, in heart, deſpiſe the things of God, even deſpiſe God himſelf. The LORD looked down from heaven, to ſee if there were any of this character that did ſeek God. 'They are all gone aſide,' &c. And in the next verſe they are diſtinguiſhed from ſaints: 'They are all workers of iniquity, 'who eat up God's people as they eat bread.' It is therefore impoſſible for the apoſtle to quote this Pſalm and apply it comparatively, to ſaints and ſinners without diſtinction, and when he is making a diſtinction between theſe two.

It is allowed that this Pſalm has reference to an extraordinary ſeaſon of wickedneſs. But this is no argument why it ſhould not, at the ſame time, eſtabliſh a general character, and the character of all natural men, as it evidently does. And in no other ſenſe can it ſuit the occaſion, for which the words are introduced from it by the apoſtle. To ſilence objections raiſed againſt him for preaching the goſpel to the Gentiles, in preference to the Jews, as the latter pretended; and to prove that the grace of the goſpel was their only ground of hope; he proceeds to ſtate and prove what all men are by nature: Jews and Gentiles brought upon a level. 'As it is written, There is none righteous, no, 'not one: There is none that underſtandeth, there is none that 'ſeeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are 'together

* Rom. 7. 18.

'together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, 'no, not one. Their throat is an open ſepulchre; with their 'tongues they have uſed deceit; the poiſon of aſps is under their 'lips: Whoſe mouth is full of curſing and bitterneſs: Their 'feet are ſwift to ſhed blood: Deſtruction and miſery are in their 'ways: And the way of peace have they not known: There is 'no fear of God before their eyes.' We again ſee it impoſſible to take this paragraph in a comparative ſenſe, applying of it to all men alike, and making no kind of diſtinction between ſaints and ſinners. It is a contradiction to ſay of believers, 'The way 'of peace have they not known, and there is no fear of God be-'fore their eyes.' We are of courſe obliged to take this whole paragraph as above ſtated, and conſider it the literal deſcription of the natural heart, and of all men by nature, not one excepted. And on this ground the caſe is very plain. Jews and Gentiles exactly the ſame by nature, and often the ſame in practice—*The poiſon of aſps is under their lips—Whoſe mouth is full of curſing and bitterneſs—Their feet are ſwift to ſhed blood—Deſtruction and miſery are in their ways—The way of peace have they not known—There is no fear of God before their eyes.* Than which nothing could more accurately decide the total ſinfulneſs of the natural heart and of all natural men. Hence the propriety of the apoſtle's preaching either to Greek or Jew, making no diſtinction. Hence alſo the doctrine of free grace, and juſtification by faith, as the only ground of hope, whether for Jew or Gentile. Which are the main things the apoſtle is about to eſtabliſh.—From this view of man's depravity it follows,

1. The natural man does nothing towards making his heart better, or reconciling of it to God. While he continues his native depravity, his heart full of enmity to God, he cannot do any thing to make his heart better.

Objection. This is denying the uſe of means. Sinners are commanded, and certainly ought to uſe means, to amend their hearts and lives.

Anſwer. It is granted that ſinners are commanded, and are under the moſt ſacred obligation to uſe means, ſo as to amend their hearts and lives. But it is equally true that unrenewed ſinners never do. For,

2. The natural man does nothing but pervert the means of grace, inſtead of uſing them aright. 'They that are in the fleſh 'cannot pleaſe God,' are 'not ſubject to the law of God, neither 'indeed can be.' All their doings are diſpleaſing and offenſive

to

to God, being oppoſed to his law, as theſe words plainly imply. All their doings are of courſe a miſuſe and abuſe of the means of grace. Hence it is the duty of every carnal or impenitent ſinner to repent immediately, and rightly uſe the means appointed for our ſalvation, inſtead of perverting them. Alſo becauſe,

3. The natural man grows more vile under the uſe of means. Under *cultivation*, as it is called, he hardens his heart more and more. This is evident from facts.—'What could have been 'done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it? Where-'fore, when I looked that it ſhould bring forth grapes, and it 'brought forth wild grapes?'* And under thoſe diſtinguiſhed advantages, in the days of Chriſt and the apoſtles, the Jews were more hardened in ſin than ever they were before. The apoſtle alſo ſays, 'Evil men and ſeducers ſhall wax worſe and worſe, 'deceiving, and being deceived.'†

Objection. This is allowed of ſuch ſinners as are going on in all manner of open and daring wickedneſs. But the caſe of awakened ſinners, and ſinners under powerful conviction, is quite different. The hearts of ſuch, it is granted, are totally depraved; yet they are in a way to make them better inſtead of worſe. Though they do not ſtrive from the heart to make themſelves better, yet they are acting and ſtriving for this from reaſon and conſcience. For certainly they are moved by the ſpirit of God, ſtriving with their reaſon and conſcience, to do what they do; therefore from reaſon and conſcience they muſt be ſtriving, to amend their hearts and lives.

Anſwer 1. It is abſurd to ſay, Men are ſtriving and acting from reaſon and conſcience, and not from the heart. Men always act from the heart when they act as moral agents. An action, either of body or mind, not coming from the heart, has neither ſin nor holineſs belonging to it, any more than the blowing of the wind. Neither has ſuch action any more tendency to do good in a moral ſenſe, or to make one's heart better, any more than the blowing of the wind. Neither can ſuch action be the fruit of the ſpirit, or of the ſtriving of the holy ſpirit, any more than the motion of the wind. Men may act agreeably to reaſon and conſcience, or they may act againſt reaſon and conſcience; but never act in a moral ſenſe from theſe mental faculties. The heart is the ſeat of all moral action. 'Out of *the heart* proceed 'evil thoughts, murders, thefts, falſe witneſs.'‡ Both reaſon and ſcripture teach us there are none of theſe crimes, or ſin of any kind, unleſs it is wilful, or from the heart. So of holineſs, it can be found only in the heart. 'With *the heart* man be-

* Iſai. 5. 4. † 2 Tim. 3. 13. ‡ Matt. 15. 19.

'lieveth unto righteouſneſs.'*—'The houſe of Iſrael is uncir-'cumciſed *in heart.*'† It is therefore impoſſible for a man to ſtrive to do good in a moral ſenſe, or to ſtrive to make his heart better, which is the ſame, unleſs he does it from the heart. Beſides, when men do ſome religious act, and it does not come from the heart, or the heart does correſpond with the action; this is only offering *a vain oblation*, ſuch as God abhors.

Anſwer, 2. When the heart is full of enmity, and nothing but enmity againſt God, it is a contradiction to ſay there is then any ſtriving for the better. The awakened ſinner may think he is ſtriving for the better, becauſe his heart is deceitful above all things. But an heart fully ſet to enmity, only enmity continually, implies one that is going on to greater degrees of enmity againſt God and his law.

Anſwer, 3. If the awakened ſinner becomes grieved, thinking himſelf deſirous of embracing Chriſt, and that Chriſt will not receive him, even when he has truly ſought to find him; this ſinner is indeed *deceiving, and being deceived;* therefore is waxing worſe and worſe.

Anſwer, 4. When the natural man is thoroughly awakened to a ſenſe of his condition; is clearly convinced of his ſin, and the ſtrictneſs of God's law, and the puniſhment he juſtly deſerves, and his imminent danger; and he will not, at this awful criſis, come to Chriſt for life; his heart muſt of courſe be ſtrongly ſet againſt the holineſs of Chriſt and the purity of his religion. This ſurely does not argue one that is growing better, but the contrary. And if conviction of his ſin and danger increaſes upon him, while his heart remains *full of enmity*, he muſt of courſe exert himſelf to find new pleas and excuſes, or ſome way at leaſt to eaſe his own mind, for not yielding to the croſs, and giving his heart in love to Chriſt. Now this is in truth hardening his heart more and more. This awakened ſinner may have ſuch an awful view of hell, rather than endure its torments forever, and being moved from a dread of puniſhment only, he may ſeemingly chooſe to have a new or holy heart; and apparently much engaged after it. But this is not deſiring an holy heart for holineſs ſake. Neither is this, ſtrictly ſpeaking, deſiring to make his heart better. Neither is this from the ſtrivings of the holy ſpirit. Neither can reaſon and conſcience, in their true ſenſe, dictate to this. Not only ſo, to deſire a new holy heart from ſelfiſh motives only, amounts to the ſame as deſiring to increaſe in hardneſs of heart and blindneſs of mind. He would have a new heart and the gift of the holy ſpirit ſubjected entirely to his own

* Rom. 10. 10. † Jerem. 9. 26.

wn private good, while the honour of God is trodden in the duſt.—What is ſaid in each of the above anſwers appears true from fact and experience, as will preſently be ſhown. Hence,

4. The natural man is reconciled to God wholly by grace, and contrary to his own will. His conviction is brought upon him, and carried on, by grace, in direct oppoſition to all the feelings of his corrupt heart. His heart in no ſenſe is a co-worker with that grace which gives him conviction, but is oppoſed to it. And grace meets him, and arreſts him, and turns him, when his heart is fully ſet to do evil. His heart is turned about from ſin to holineſs, and to fear and love God, by grace alone. 'By 'grace are ye ſaved through faith; and that not of yourſelves: 'it is the gift of God.'* 'And you that were ſometime alien-'ated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath 'he reconciled,—to preſent you holy and unblameable and un-'reproveable in his ſight.'†

Now theſe things appear evident from fact and experience, as well as from expreſs words of ſcripture. Such as are converted from ſin to holineſs in their riper years, or at an age capable of relating what paſſes in their minds; ſuch do in fact witneſs to the truth of this doctrine. They have ſeen the total vileneſs of their hearts. They have ſeen that their hearts were growing more inſtead of leſs ſinful, till the moment God gave them repentance. They have ſeen all their doings and ſtrivings, before repentance, to be right againſt the ſtrivings of the ſpirit. They have ſeen all their own notions of making their hearts ſome better, before repentance, to be nothing but deluſions; and the grace of God alone has kept them, as they hope, from fatal deluſion. They have ſeen that they were ſtriving with their whole ſtrength to deceive themſelves, ſo to reſt on a falſe foundation. And that they really were in heart, and in the ſight of God, through the whole of their conviction, *evil men and ſeducers, deceiving, and being deceived.* Their conviction, therefore, every ſtage of it, and their converſion is the gift of God; and what they had not before ſought after. Theſe things they frankly confeſs.

To the ſame point Dr. Witſius ſays, 'Since our nature is be-'come like an evil tree, after having taſted of the forbidden tree, 'it can produce no fruit truly good and acceptable to God, and 'do nothing by which it can prepare itſelf for the grace of regen-'eration; unleſs a perſon can be thought to prepare himſelf for 'grace by ſin.—God teſtifies, that, in the firſt approach of his 'grace, *he is found of them that ſought him not, and aſked* 'not

* Eph. 2. 8 † Coloſ. 1. 21, 22.

'*not for him.*—We have not certainly received grace, becauſe 'we are willing; but grace is given us, while we are ſtill un-'willing.'*

Objection. God has promiſed, 'Aſk, and it ſhall be given 'you, ſeek, and ye ſhall find.'† And God has commanded all men to pray unto him. Unregenerate men are therefore commanded to pray for new hearts; with a promiſe of being heard, and new hearts given them, in anſwer to their prayers; provided they *ſincerely* pray to God.

Anſwer. The words, *ſincere*, *ſincerely*, and *ſincerity*, are, in all, found twelve times, throughout the bible.‡ The original word is ſix times tranſlated into theſe words, in the marginal reading.§ Which makes, in the whole, eighteen inſtances of its uſe. Fifteen of theſe expreſs our immediate duty to God, and evidently mean no other than godly ſincerity. The remaining three expreſs man's duty to his neighbour. So that, whenever this word is uſed to intend our immediate duty to God, it is to diſtinguiſh our cordial ſubmiſſion and love to him, from that which is only outward and feigned. And as, in the above places referred to in the marginal reading, the word is rendered, *perfect*, *undefiled*, *harmleſs*; it gives decided proof that God will accept of no deſires ſhort of perfect or undefiled ones. When men pray with ſuch deſires, as all men are bound to do, it is granted they are heard and anſwered; otherwiſe they are not. And when men's hearts are reconciled to the truth, they can think of offering no other than holy deſires to an holy God.

5. For the natural man to be reconciled to God, his evil heart muſt be taken away and a good heart given him. His carnal mind muſt be ſubdued and one implanted in him which is ſpiritual. His enmity to God muſt be ſlain, and love to God begun in his ſoul. This great work is done by the power of God, as the firſt and only cauſe. Thus God ſays to his ancient people, 'A new heart will I give you, and a new ſpirit will I put within 'you: and I will take away the ſtony heart out of your fleſh, 'and I will give you an heart of fleſh.' Divine power is often expreſſed in ſcripture, as being the ſole cauſe of this great work. Which power and grace the ſinner always fights againſt, till his ſtony heart is taken away and a new ſpirit put within him. It is a contradiction to call it *a ſtony heart* unleſs it does fight againſt divine grace, inſtead of yielding to it. But this fixed and determined

* *Oeconomy of the covenants*, Vol. 2. p. 57. † Mat. 7. 7.

‡ Joſh. xxiv. 14. Judg. ix. 16, 19. 1 Cor. v. 8. 2 Cor. i. 12. ii. 17. viii. 8. Eph. vi. 24. Phil. i. 10, 16. Tit. ii. 7. 1 Pet. ii. 2.

§ Gen. xvii. 1. xx. 5. Deut. xviii. 13 Pſal. cxix. 1. Eph. iv. 15. Phil. ii. 15.

determined oppoſition againſt divine grace argues the great power of God, whereby the ſinner is reconciled to him. The ſtout heart, the heart of ſtone, the adamant is broken, ſubdued, and taken away; and a meek, humble, yielding ſpirit is given. Which work brings to view the great power of God: as well the love of God, which alone moves him to this work.

Objection. The text juſt cited, which is from Ezek. xxxvi. 26, being joined with other promiſes to the houſe of Iſrael, is followed with theſe words; 'Thus ſaith the Lord God, I will 'yet for this be enquired of by the houſe of Iſrael, to do it for 'them.' Which is ſaid by the objector to be a ſpecial, deſigned command for unregenerate men to pray; and that God takes away their 'ſtony heart,' and gives them a new-heart, in anſwer to their prayers.

Anſwer, 1. That unregenerate men are ſpecially commanded to pray, has been granted. The point is, whether they are commanded to pray with a carnal mind. Or whether they are allowed to indulge their ſtony heart long enough to make a prayer. And whether God anſwers ſuch prayers. If he does, where is the advantage of taking away the ſtony heart? Or, where is the advantage of pouring out a ſpirit of grace and ſupplications? This objection, therefore, deſtroys all diſtinction between ſaints and ſinners. The loweſt degree of right aſking or praying to God implies ſaving grace. The loweſt degree of true ſeeking to God, and that which God anſwers, implies repentance, faith, hope, love, and every chriſtian grace. The objection ſuppoſes the unregenerate man to have all theſe graces, becauſe his prayer is ſuch as God anſwers. Which is making the unregenerate and the regenerate, the ſaint and the ſinner both one. A doctrine totally repugnant to ſcripture. Hence this objection cannot be admitted.

Anſwer 2. God himſelf has ſilenced this objection. Ezek. xiv. 3. 'Theſe men have ſet up their idols in their heart, and 'put the ſtumbling block of their iniquity before their face: 'ſhould I be enquired of at all by them?' And xx. 3, 'Thus 'ſaith the Lord God, Are ye come to enquire of me? As I live, 'ſaith the Lord God, I will not be enquired of by you.' And ſee v. 31. Again, Iſai. i. 15, 'When ye make many prayers, 'I will not hear: your hands are full of blood.' But ſuch ſinners as will not come to Chriſt for life, even when they are under powerful conviction, and ſee themſelves going down to hell, are they not guilty of the blood of Chriſt? And do they not perſevere in their guilt? Therefore, the LORD as often ſays he will

not

not be enquired of, as he ſays he will. And has declared in what manner he will not, and in what manner he will be enquired of.

Anſwer, 3. The plain ſenſe of the above paſſage, Ezek. xxxvi. 26, and to the end of this chapter, is an encouragement as well as a command to the whole houſe of Iſrael to pray, with *a broken ſpirit*, for what is there promiſed. And, as it appears, this was afterwards made one article in their public prayers. In which ſome few of them undoubtedly did pray with *a contrite heart*. For this, therefore the LORD was enquired of by the houſe of Iſrael, to do it for them. The fulfilment of this prophecy cauſed them to unite with one heart and one voice, inſtead of many of them being only formal. Hence the above objection appears to be a miſtake, united to divert ſinners from their immediate duty to Chriſt and their own ſouls. Which further argues the neceſſity of divine power to reconcile our hearts to God and to the doctrines of the goſpel.

6. The heart of man is reconciled to God by the *immediate* power of God.

Means are abſolutely neceſſary, in this caſe. To be capable of doing the will of God, we muſt have underſtanding or ſpeculative knowledge of his will. Without knowledge we can neither have love nor hatred. Without knowledge we can neither do good nor evil, in a moral ſenſe. The ſervant muſt know his maſter's will, or he can neither do it, nor refuſe to do it. We muſt have conviction, or ſpeculative knowledge of our duty to God and man, before we can, in this caſe, either chooſe or refuſe. Theſe things appear to be ſelf-evident. But all our ſpeculative knowledge of right and wrong, in a moral view, is wholly by means; divine Revelation being the great mean of conviction. The holy Spirit may impreſs the means more powerfully, and quicken and brighten our intellectual faculties, enforcing clearer conviction, at one time than at another. Yet he always does this by means. It appears a plain caſe, that we have all our knowledge of this kind by means, by ſecond cauſes, by external objects, and objects of ſight and ſenſe. Therefore means are abſolutely eſſential. Without means we can have no knowledge of the divine will, and without knowledge we cannot do his will.

Means of themſelves, however, never change the heart. Means of themſelves do nothing towards making the heart good. The ſervant with his treacherous heart, the more he knows his maſter's will, the more is he prepared to hate him and do him miſchief. But, allowing this ſervant's heart to be changed and to become

become good, then, the more he knows, the more is he capable of loving and profiting his maſter. The ſervant's great knowledge fits him either to do great good or evil. But his knowledge and means of knowledge do nothing towards making his heart good. If they did, then the beſt informed would always be the moſt faithful ſervants. Which is contrary to fact. And facts related in ſcripture prove, that ſome who have the beſt means uſed with them, are the greateſt enemies to God. 'Many will 'ſay unto me in that day (the day of judgment,) Lord, Lord, 'Have we not propheſied in thy name? And in thy name have 'caſt out devils? And in thy name done many wonderful 'works?'——'We have eaten and drunk in thy preſence, and 'thou haſt taught in our ſtreets'——'And then will I profeſs 'unto them, I never knew you: depart from me ye workers of 'iniquity. There ſhall be weeping and gnaſhing of teeth.'* Theſe things and many others in ſcripture, ſome we have already ſeen, give evidence that means do nothing, of themſelves towards renewing the carnal heart.

Beſides, when the Spirit of God enforces the means, and the ſinner is awakened and convicted in his own conſcience, even in this caſe his heart grows worſe and inſtead of better. As he has an increaſing ſenſe of his own guilt, of the wrath and curſe of God, and the worth of his own ſoul, in the ſame manner does his enmity ariſe and increaſe againſt God. The experience and confeſſion of believers, we have ſeen, is witneſs to this. This alſo appears evident from univerſal experience and obſervation. It is ſufficient to ſtate two or three particulars. After a revival of religion, ſuch as have fallen away from great awakenings and conviction, they are like 'the dog that has turned to his own 'vomit again'——'the laſt ſtate of that man is worſe than the 'firſt.'† This ſudden change of external conduct, and running more greedily into all ſin; this could not be, had not the enmity of the heart increaſed, inſtead of abatting, during the whole time of conviction.——When Chriſt went to Nazareth, where he had been brought up, and there preached in their ſynagogue, his preaching was attended with remarkable conviction on the minds of his hearers. The conſequence was, 'All they in the 'ſynagogue were filled with wrath'‡ againſt him. Unleſs the powerful conviction on the minds of the Jews, at the preaching of Chriſt and the apoſtles, was directly followed with repentance, then was their wrath ſo much the more ſtirred up againſt them. This was generally if not always the caſe.

Hence *the immediate* power of God is neceſſary, and as the only

* Matt. 7. 22. Luke 13. 26, 27. † 2 Pet. 2. 22 and Matt. 12. 45. ‡ Luke 4. 28.

only cauſe, to reconcile the heart of man to God. For, firſt If means wholly fail, in this caſe, and the heart grows worſe inſtead of better under conviction: it is impoſſible it ever ſhould be reconciled, but by the immediate power of God. Secondly. The heart is reconciled by the Spirit of God; his taking poſſeſſion of, and abiding in, the heart. That is, by his quickening and governing influence. But when God takes away the ſtony heart, and gives a new heart, and puts his ſpirit within, and cauſes them to walk in his ſtatutes; this has all the appearance of the immediate agency of his Spirit. Thirdly. Reconciliation of the heart to God, is love to God. And 'LOVE IS OF GOD,'* his own pure offspring. All the means or ſecond cauſes in the world cannot produce love. Paul may plant and Apollos water, but God alone can give the increaſe. Miniſters may preach, yet none but God can give love to the word preached. Fourthly. Scripture often uſes terms which give this idea of the work of grace, and of ſuch as are cordially reconciled to God by his grace. Thus, they are ſaid to be *begotten, born, born again, born of God, born of the Spirit, renewed by the holy Spirit, renewed in the ſpirit of their mind; quickened, created, created in righteouſneſs, created in true holineſs, created unto good works, and made alive from the dead.* All which expreſs the immediate power of God. As when God raiſes the dead, or creates the world out of nothing. Fifthly. This power of God on the heart is called *the exceeding greatneſs* of his power, and *the effectual working* of his power.† Becauſe it removes the only obſtacle in the way. It deſtroys the very thing that reſiſts conviction, and that fights againſt free grace. It ſlays the *enmity* of the heart, and creates it in righteouſneſs and true holineſs. And whereas this enmity reſiſts all means, and all conviction, and does always reſiſt the power of the Holy Ghoſt, when he operates only by means; ſo the *effectual* cauſe for deſtroying this enmity, and creating love in its ſtead, can be no other than the immediate power of God. Hence,

7. It appears that God reconciles the heart of man by an inſtantaneous act. For, firſt. A creative act of divine power has every appearance of an inſtantaneous act. Secondly. The ſtony heart is not gradually made better, but the ſtony heart is taken away, and a new heart given. Which alſo has every appearance of a momentary work. Thirdly. The apoſtle ſays, Without *charity* there is nothing, nothing but enmity.‡ Which denies a ſtate of indifferency. And a ſtate of indifferency is denied by Chriſt's words, 'He that is not with me is againſt me.'§

The

* 1 John 4. 7. † Eph. 1. 19 and 3. 7. ‡ 1 Cor. 13 3. § Matt. 12 30.

The enmity therefore is ſlain, and charity or love created, as ſuddenly as one thought follows another. Fourthly. This appears to be the only rational ground, on which the goſpel can be preached. Salvation is offered to dying men, ſuch as may depart this life the next moment. But how is the goſpel ſuited to dying men, and how are all things now ready, and now the accepted time, unleſs turning to the LORD is an inſtantaneous act?

8. Reconciliation to God is the act of man as well as the work of the holy Spirit. The act is wholly man's, and the holy Spirit is the ſole cauſe of this act. Preſident Edwards ſays, 'In effi-' cacious grace we are not merely paſſive, nor yet does God do ' ſome, and we do the reſt. But God does all, and we act all. ' For that is what he produces, viz. our own acts. God is the ' only proper author and fountain: we only are the proper ac-' tors.'*

9. Man is perfectly free in reconciling his heart to God, although this act is cauſed by divine power. This *effectual* working of divine power is no interruption of, but harmonizes with, man's freedom. God gives a new heart; a new heart is a free, willing mind. God gives repentance; repentance is a free act. God gives love; love is not forced but free. God gives faith; faith worketh by love. God gives hope; hope maketh not aſhamed; becauſe the love of God is ſhed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghoſt. The beſt of gifts, coming from the beſt of beings, from God himſelf, does this leſſen man's liberty?—'Thanks be to God which put the ſame earneſt care in-' to the heart of Titus for you. For indeed he accepted the ex-' hortation; but being more forward, of his own accord he went ' unto you.'† Titus was *more forward*, and he engaged about a deed of charity *of his own accord*, becauſe *God put it into his heart.*———This view of the ſubject will ſhow us a few things, uſeful as to our main object.

1ſt. The notion of ſending ſinners to hell, to make them love God and be fitted for heaven, appears an idle notion. It is out of the power of means to renew the heart. All poſſible means can make no impreſſion upon the ſtony heart, nor give an heart of fleſh. The enmity is ſlain and love is produced by the creative power of God only. Love is of God, his own pure offſpring. Hell torments can do more towards producing holy love in ſinful beings, than they can towards creating holy beings out of nothing. And as regeneration is effected inſtantaneouſly, ſo the divine Spirit can regenerate ſinners, in this world as well as any where elſe.

* Miſcel. Vol. 2. p. 251. † 2 Cor. 8. 16, 17.

Allowing the torments of hell are ſuited to give the cleareſt conviction, and that conviction which attends converſion, in the preſent life, ſtill this argues nothing for Univerſaliſts. Conviction of itſelf makes the heart no better. The more wicked ſervants know of their maſter, let him be ever ſo good, the more do they deſpiſe him. So is the caſe of wicked men towards God, their enmity againſt him increaſes with their increaſing conviction. And when God gives men up to their own hearts luſts, they haſten to fill up the meaſure of their iniquity. Theſe things which are facts, in this world, Revelation employs to illuſtrate the ſtate of the damned, in the next world. It is alſo plain from the nature of the caſe, that the more the enemies of God know of him, unleſs their enmity is ſlain by almighty power, the more are they prepared to blaſpheme his holy name. Allowing the damned, therefore, to have the cleareſt conviction, this only fits them to blaſpheme God, and gnaw their tongues with pain. Hence it is vain to pretend that hell is *a purging fire;* eſpecially as the bible gives no ſuch intimation, but ſays every thing to the contrary.

3ly. The notion that all men cannot, conſiſtently with their liberty, have repentance in this life, but ſome men muſt unavoidably be ſent to hell, before they can repent; this alſo appears an idle notion. Univerſaliſts ſuppoſe, the torments of the damned cauſe them to repent more freely than any thing they meet with in this life, and, in many caſes, that theſe torments are neceſſary to human liberty. As though all men were not free, while in this world! As though ſome men become more free in hell! As though it were free for ſome men to repent, while in time, but for others, they muſt be ſent among the damned to make them free agents!

If any conſtitution God has formed for his rational creatures, is complete, it muſt be the conſtitution of grace, under which all men are placed. It is as free for all men to receive the pardon of their ſins, as the gift of grace, as it was for the angels to perſevere in a juſtified ſtate, by virtue of their own works. Certainly if we believe the goſpel, we muſt believe that *all things are now ready.* And that the *water of life* is free to *every creature.* Beſides, it is ſelf-evident that we are as free according to our capacities as the angels in heaven. If we love God, we do it freely. If we hate God, we do it freely. If we perſevere in ſin, it is our free act: If we turn from ſin, it is our free act: perfectly free in going the broad road down to hell; perfectly

perfectly free in turning into the ſtreight and narrow path, that leadeth to life eternal.

3ly. This ſubject both argues and vindicates the ſovereignty of God, in his making one a veſſel of mercy and another a veſſel of wrath. The ſinner does nothing to move divine mercy. The ſinner retains the full ſtrength of his enmity to free grace, till the moment he is ſubdued by free grace. Nothing but God's own love can therefore move him to convert and ſave ſinners. His love muſt of courſe be free and ſovereign. Again, God does no injuſtice to ſuch ſinners as he leaves and fits for deſtruction. How can they complain of God's conduct to them, when they *freely* go the way to deſtruction? when they have their choice, and harden their own hearts? How can they complain when they *make light* of the riches of divine grace? when their carnal hearts do always reſiſt the conviction and ſtrivings of the holy Spirit?—Inſtead of doing them injuſtice, God endures with much longſuffering the veſſels of wrath fitted to deſtruction.

I am, &c.

LETTER II.

Full atonement for all, *conſiſtent with the final perdition of* part *of mankind, illuſtrated and proved from facts.*

My dear Friend,

HOW proviſion ſhould be made for the whole, and only part benefitted by this proviſion, is made a ſerious queſtion. Ample proviſion, ſo as all could be ſaved, and this proviſion appropriated only to part of our race; how can this be? Or where is the propriety of the divine conduct?——Facts and examples ſhall anſwer to this queſtion. Which examples are ſuited to ſhow us the ſinfulneſs of ſinners, and ſuch as periſh when there is full proviſion made for them; as well as vindicate the divine conduct, in the caſe before us. Here it will be neceſſary to repeat ſome of the ſame things we had in the laſt letter, as well as produce other facts for this purpoſe. Therefore,

I. God gave to all the angels, to one as well as to another, opportunity to have continued in holineſs and happineſs forever. God made the ſame proviſion for thoſe angels that fell, as he did for thoſe that ſtood perfect. Thoſe that loſt their holineſs and their heaven, loſt their all, had exactly the ſame means and motives, the ſame opportunity to have retained their manſions of bliſs

and

and glory, as thoſe who actually did retain them. God alſo could have continued all the angels in holineſs, had he ſeen it beſt. By the power and agency of his holy Spirit on their hearts, he could have cauſed them all to perſevere in holineſs and happineſs without end. God could have done this for the whole, in the ſame manner as he did it for part of the angels, had it been according to his own wiſdom and love, or beſt for the univerſe.

In this event, reſpecting the angels, three things are plain and undeniable. One is the full proviſion made for their eternal happineſs, and for the whole of them without exception. Another thing is, God could have applied this full proviſion by the *effectual working* of his power, and confirmed them all in endleſs happineſs, had he choſen to do it. Therefore God did not chooſe to do it, otherwiſe he would have done it; and the endleſs happineſs of the whole of the angels, inſtead of part of them, would have been completed. A third thing is the ſin of the angels that fell, or *kept not their firſt eſtate.* Theſe things are undeniably evident to every one that holds to the bible, or believes in the fall of angels. No one pretends to queſtion the ample proviſion made for them. None can queſtion or deny the abſolute power and controul of God on their hearts; and that God could have cauſed all the angels to continue faithful and obedient to him, as eaſily as he did only part of them. Neither can any one queſtion the ſin of angels, ſuch as rebelled againſt God. The ſin or blameable cauſe in their rebellion lies wholly on the rebels themſelves; God's throne is forever guiltleſs. This none can deny.

This applies directly to the queſtion before us. Here is full proviſion made for all, and appropriated only to part. Rich proviſion made for the whole, and but part benefitted by it. At the ſame time, the *effectual power* of God decides the caſe of both claſſes. The ſovereign will of God decides the caſe both of the elect and reprobate angels. Such as God cauſes to remain in holineſs and happineſs, do thus remain. Such as God does not cauſe to remain in holineſs, do not thus remain; but fall into ſin and miſery. In the midſt of this full proviſion, the ſovereign pleaſure of God does therefore determine the lot of the holy and happy, ſo of the ſinful and miſerable. At the ſame time alſo the rebel angels are perfectly free in their rebellion, and of courſe the blame reſts entirely on the rebels themſelves. Now, if God can order things thus for angels, then why not in the ſame manner for men? Certainly God is under no obligation to recover ſinful men, the whole of them, to a ſtate of holineſs and happineſs, any more than he was to continue all the angels in holineſs

holineſs and happineſs. And if God can leave part of the angels to everlaſting miſery, when he has prepared every mean for their eternal happineſs, then why ſhall he not leave part of mankind to the ſame miſery, when *all things are ready* in the goſpel for their eternal happineſs? Hence the objection, that God acts inconſiſtently to make full proviſion for the ſalvation of all men, by the atonement, when at the ſame time, he applies it only to the ſalvation of part of mankind; this objection goes directly to impeach or blame the conduct of God towards the angels. Likewiſe, to charge God with injuſtice and partiality, provided he *elects* ſome and *reprobates* others of mankind, is the ſame as to charge, God with injuſtice and partiality, becauſe he *elects* part and *reprobates* part of the angels. But we will ſee the following objections.

Objection 1. Although God is under no obligation to men, for any merit in them, yet, in conſequence of the atonement, he has bound himſelf to apply its fulneſs to all men, in ſuch manner as to ſave all men. Chriſt has died for all men, and his death or atonement has laid God under obligation to ſave all men. Whereas he was under no obligation to keep angels from apoſtaſy.

Anſwer. If God has bound himſelf, in conſequence of the atonement, to ſave all men, he has done this for ſome reaſon. If God has bound himſelf by the death of Chriſt, to ſave all men from the curſe of the law, and make them forever happy, there muſt be a ground or reaſon for this part of his conduct. And the reaſon can be no other than this, that the death of Chriſt has rendered the execution of the curſe of the law of no uſe, even on any part of mankind. It is certain God will not give up his juſtice. Divine juſtice muſt be maintained either by the death of Chriſt, or by the eternal damnation of ſinners. And if juſtice is ſo maintained and vindicated by the death of Chriſt, as that the eternal damnation of ſinners could do nothing towards maintaining of it, then all men will be ſaved, otherwiſe they will not. But why ſhould God threaten that which can be of no uſe? Why ſhould the goſpel abound with uſeleſs threatenings, to the ungodly? Why a threatening of everlaſting puniſhment, when all men are completely delivered from ſuch puniſhment? Why a threatening, to avenge his juſtice, after his juſtice is ſatisfied?—— Allowing the threatenings of the law to be juſt, then it is juſt for God to execute them: Then are they of uſe to vindicate divine juſtice, in the eternal damnation of impenitent ſinners: Then the atonement has not laid God under obligation to ſave all men from the curſe of the law.

From

From what we have ſeen in the laſt letter it is evident, notwithſtanding full atonement, that God is under no more obligation to ſecure the happineſs of all men, than he was to ſecure all the angels. To charge God, therefore, with partiality, becauſe he elects one man to life eternal, and leaves another to periſh forever; to charge God with inconſiſtency, becauſe he makes complete proviſion in the goſpel for all, and converts this to the final benefit of a part only; ſuch cavils and objections go directly to impeach and blame divine conduct in the event of angels. ——Let men but ſee the deceit, pride, and obſtinacy of their hearts, and they can have no hope but in the *electing grace* of God: they can have no hope but in that *effectual working* of divine power, which ſinners ſo deſpiſed. Inſtead of calling God's *way unequal*, we may well join with the prophet, and ſay, 'It 'is of the LORD's mercies that we are not conſumed.'* From his own boundleſs love, has God opened a door of mercy for ruined men, while he paſſes by rebel angels. But if we live and die deſpiſing infinite pity and love, ſtill calling God an hard maſter, out of our own mouth ſhall we be judged at the laſt day. ——How does God injure ſuch as he gives up to a reprobate mind, when theſe reprobates have their choice, and will not be drawn unto Chriſt? Is not God's way equal, when he conſigns no more of mankind to the flames of hell, than is for the public good? Is not God's way perfect, when his grace is ſufficient to make as many holy and happy as is for the higheſt happineſs of the univerſe?

It is granted that the Father gave a certain number of our race to the Son, as a reward for his obedience, ſufferings and death; and all that the Father gave the Son ſhall come unto him. And this certain number was elected or *choſen out of the world, before the world was*. Where ſcripture treats of this matter, there is plainly taught, in the ſame connection, the doctrine of *election* and *reprobation*; as well the ſin of the reprobate or of *the world*, who hate both the Father and the Son. But, though the caſe both of the redeemed and the damned was known and determined in the divine mind from eternity, yet this makes no difference as to the uſe of means, motives, and other things reſpecting each party. It is no leſs grace to the redeemed, becauſe this grace was prepared and determined before the world was. Juſtice is not leſſened nor altered to the damned, becauſe this juſtice was determined from eternity. And becauſe God determined from eternity to leave Pharaoh and all the reprobate to their own luſts, or becauſe he determined to harden their hearts, that they might

feal

* Lam. 3. 22.

ſeal their own deſtruction; yet this predetermination of God alters not their freedom nor their ſin. Pharaoh and all the wicked are perfectly free, they act with their whole minds in hardening their own hearts. And it is not poſſible they ſhould ever blame any being but themſelves, for their hardening their hearts, nor for their endleſs miſery in hell. Beſides, this very thing is illuſtrated by the caſe of angels. God undoubtedly determined before he made the angels, which of them he would preſerve in holineſs and happineſs, and which he would give up to ſin and miſery. But this determination of God, we are aſſured, does not leſſen the ſin and ill deſert of devils. Neither does it leſſen the virtue and praiſeworthineſs of good angels. How then do the fixed decrees of God leſſen the ſin of Pharaoh and all the reprobate? Or how do they leſſen the virtue and praiſeworthineſs of ſuch as repent, and love our Lord Jeſus Chriſt?

Again, as the widely different lots determined for angels; one for holineſs, another for ſin; one for heaven, another for hell; as theſe were ſecrets in the divine mind, not known among the angels, till the rebels determined for themſelves, by their own ſin; ſo it was conſiſtent to uſe means with all of them, without exception. In this caſe, means, motives, warnings, and encouragements were ſuited to have their tendency and weight, with one as well as another. So it is wholly unknown to us, who among men will be found, at the laſt great day, either on the *right hand* or *the left*; till each one has determined this for himſelf, by his deeds done in the body. It is therefore conſiſtent to uſe means with one man as well as another. Indeed it is impoſſible to make a diſtinction while the appointed lot of each one, for eternity, remains a ſecret with God. Not only ſo, the conſiſtency of uſing means with men, rational beings, free agents, accountable to God, capable of honouring God, capable of diſhonouring God, capable of enjoying God's love, or feeling the weight of his wrath, forever; the conſiſtency of uſing means with ſuch appears ſelf-evident; and *whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear.* And to deny this is the ſame as to charge God with folly, for uſing means in heaven before the angels ſinned.

Objection 2. Men were afterwards created, redeemed and reſtored, ſome of them at leaſt, to enjoy and poſſeſs what angels loſt. Whereas no other beings, that we know of, will ever be reſtored to the place of ſuch men as are finally loſt. Provided, that is, part of mankind ſhould be finally loſt. And as the atonement has made all things ready for all men, ſo part of this proviſion,

ſion, in this caſe, will not only be loſt to ſome men, but loſt to all other rational creatures. Which does not agree with the moſt perfect conſiſtency of divine conduct.

Anſwer. Though ſome men are reſtored to the ſame heaven as angels loſt, yet they are not reſtored by the ſame means as angels loſt. The means or proviſion for the ſecurity of angels, is that for which we now contend. Law and ſtrict juſtice were their ſecurity, with the various means, motives, and bleſſings harmonizing with this conſtitution. But a different conſtitution, a conſtitution of grace, with correſponding means, was introduced for the redemption of men. This proviſion for the ſecurity of angels, this complete proviſion, from which many of them fell, was not therefore appropriated to the good and happineſs of men, nor other rational beings of whom we have any account. It certainly was not for the happineſs of ſuch angels as *left their own habitation*, and for whom it was firſt prepared. To them it was entirely loſt. This cannot be denied. And this is ſufficient for the preſent argument. For then, with the ſame propriety of divine conduct, may the means of grace be loſt to ſome men, and ſome men eternally periſh notwithſtanding full atonement.

Furthermore, this objection virtually allows that God left part of the angels to fall into ſin and miſery, to make way for, and to advance the happineſs of ſome men. And this muſt be allowed, unleſs we diſallow the holy ſcriptures. This is the ſame, however, as allowing that God may doom ſome of his rational creatures to miſery, to advance the happineſs of others. Or that the miſery of hell is of uſe to complete the happineſs of heaven, and is neceſſary to this end. But this entirely takes away the moſt eſſential argument in the univerſal ſcheme. Which is, that the ſole end of puniſhment in hell is to lead the damned to repentance. Allowing, therefore, that the miſery of hell is of uſe, and neceſſary to this end, to complete the happineſs of heaven, then the miſery of hell is neceſſary to vindicate divine juſtice. For this is one principle thing which gives joy in heaven. Were not divine juſtice vindicated and glorified, in the beſt manner, before the hoſts of heaven, their happineſs could not be complete, or could not ariſe to the higheſt degree. Then the torments of the damned are neceſſary for this purpoſe: Then the torments of the damned are neceſſary for ſome other purpoſe, aſide from leading the damned to repentance: Then the ſole purpoſe of the torments of the damned, urged by univerſaliſts, muſt be given up: Then univerſaliſts cannot prove that the damned ever will repent;

and

and of courſe they cannot prove that the damned will ever be delivered from hell.

Objection 3. The univerſaliſts will now aſk, How does all this apply to the caſe before us? God was at little or no expenſe in providing for angels, compared to what he has been at, in giving Chriſt to die for us. If Chriſt died for all, ſhed his blood for all, and all are not ſaved, but ſome eternally damned, then is Chriſt dead in vain as to ſuch. And his blood, even the blood of God-man, is ſo far loſt, or poured out as a thing of no value.

Anſwer. The queſtion, in reply to this, is whether any of this loſs is ſuſtained on the part of God? If God glorifies his juſtice in the final perdition of impenitent ſinners, eſpecially ſuch as diſobey the goſpel, we can perceive no loſs on his part. And if this gives public evidence of God's infinite holineſs, or of his infinite hatred to ſin, then it is of public benefit, inſtead of public loſs. And if this moſt awful diſplay of divine juſtice, in hell, does glorify juſtice to the higheſt degree, then is the higheſt good of the public promoted by it, inſtead of any loſs to the public. It is a loſs to individuals, and Chriſt is dead in vain to ſome men. Of this there is no queſtion.—We will ſee more of this preſently.

We cannot help remarking, in this place, how the Holy Ghoſt has warned us from the example of angels. The angels were created a noble, excellent order of beings. Were raiſed to that exalted, dignified, and glorious ſtate, around the throne of God: having every poſſible motive to engage their love and perfect obedience to their great Creator; ſo to abide in their ſtate of conſummate bliſs and glory forever. Notwithſtanding all this, which their bountiful Creator had done for them, many of them roſe in rebellion againſt him. And 'God ſpared not the angels 'that ſinned, but caſt them down to hell.'——'The angels which 'kept not their firſt eſtate, but left their own habitation, he hath 'reſerved in everlaſting chains under darkneſs, unto the judg-'ment of the great day.'* In connection with this laſt paſſage, we have theſe words: 'The Lord having ſaved the people out 'of the land of Egypt, afterwards deſtroyed them that believed 'not.' This ſalvation of Iſrael from Egypt, and in the Red Sea, was a ſure pledge of the all-ſufficiency of the Meſſiah, and his fulneſs of grace for our eternal ſalvation. Which fullneſs of grace, vouchſaf'd to Iſrael, is here likened to the bleſſed ſtate of the angels above.—'How dreadful is this place! This is none 'other than the houſe of God, and this is the gate of heaven.'† Therefore, from the midſt of this grace, from the midſt of ſalva-

* 2 Pet. 2. 4, and Jude 6. † Gen. 28 17.

tion itſelf,* ſome men may fall; yea, ſuch as *believe not* muſt fall, as the angels fell from heaven and were caſt down to hell.—What folly, what preſumption, O what madneſs, to trifle with the grace of God!——— But,

II. This full proviſion by the atonement has hitherto, in a great meaſure, been loſt to mankind, certainly while they live in this world. It is a fact that the body of mankind have not improved it, nor enjoyed the happy fruits of it, while in the preſent life. Notwithſtanding all Chriſt has done to deliver the world from ſin and ſorrow, the world is not delivered. Chriſt has come, the Saviour of the world, but the world is not ſaved from ſin and miſery. None can deny, but that the atonement removes every obſtacle out of the way, ſo as all men, in this life, are free to become holy and happy. Nothing ſtands in the way, excepting the enmity of the carnal heart, which prevents the whole world becoming the paradiſe of God. And God has abſolute power over the hearts of men. He is able to remove this enmity. He is able to make all men, every where, holy and happy. By the *exceeding greatneſs* of his power, God is able to make the whole world, throughout all ages, like the *new Jeruſalem*, coming down from above. The atonement has made proviſion for this, and God could do it, provided it were beſt. For wiſe reaſons God has not done it. The hiſtory of every paſt age is a hiſtory of ſin and miſery. Heathen poets conſtantly tell us of the *iron age*, and of the perpetual reign of all ſorts of evil. And if we look into the ſacred volume, with few exceptions, we find one continued race of thieves, drunkards, revilers, adulterers, whoremongers, idolaters, liars, robbers, and murderers. The ſacred pages alſo inform us, how God from time to time has, in righteous indignation againſt theſe crimes, viſited the world with ſore judgments. This view of the ſubject leads to the following things:

1. The free agency and ill deſert of the wicked world. Men are perfectly free, this is plain from experience. We are as conſcious of our freedom as we are of our own exiſtence. There needs no argument to prove this. Neither can we be argued out of it, any ſooner than we can be made to believe we are not in being. The world of mankind, going on in ſin, blaſpheming the God that made them, and hating one another, they are perfectly free, either to turn from ſin, or to continue in ſin. This is evident at firſt thought. The ill deſert of the wicked world is alſo evident at firſt view. The drunkard, thief, liar, reviler, &c. they are ill deſerving; they deſerve the curſe of God's holy

* The goſpel is called *the goſpel of ſalvation*, bringing and offering ſalvation to every creature.

ly law. There needs no further proof of this, than to ſtate their crimes againſt them. There needs no proof of the ill deſert of the thief or liar, only to prove he is a thief or liar. In like manner, other crimes men are guilty of, the evidence of their ill deſert goes with their crimes, Eſpecially the ſin of deſpiſing offered ſalvation carries evidence with it of its own guilt, or deſert of evil. Thus God calls, but the ſinner refuſes. Chriſt invites, but the ſinner *will not* come unto him, for life eternal. The ſinner's crime in this caſe need only be ſtated, to prove that he deſerves a moſt aggravated puniſhment in hell. And to prove an heathen deſerves judgment without mercy, we need only to prove that this heathen is *implacable and unmerciful.*

2. The hand and counſel of God relative to the ſtate and conduct of the wicked world. This alſo is clearly evident.

Of the heathen world, as ſcripture informs us, 'God ſuffered 'them all to walk in their own ways.'*—'God gave them up to 'uncleanneſs through the luſts of their own hearts—God gave 'them up unto vile affections—God gave them over to a reprobate mind.'† This is ſaid concerning the heathen for the ſpace of two thouſand years, or from the days of Moſes till the coming of Chriſt, and equally applies to every age of heatheniſm. But here is the hand and counſel of God, which determines their character and conduct. It is God who gives them over to a reprobate mind: It is God who gives them up to vile affections. This is further confirmed by particular inſtances of divine conduct concerning the heathen. Of Pharaoh God ſaid, 'I will harden his heart, that he ſhall not let the 'people go.' Of the Egyptians God ſaid, 'And I, behold, I will 'harden the hearts of the Egyptians, and they ſhall follow 'them:'‡ that is, *they ſhall follow* Iſrael into the Red Sea, that there they might be deſtroyed. Of the Canaanites it is ſaid, 'It 'was of the LORD to harden their hearts, that they ſhould come 'againſt Iſrael in battle, that he might deſtroy them utterly.'§ Whenever men go out to battle againſt each other, it is the LORD that ſtirreth them up, and hardeneth their hearts againſt each other, as far as they are hardened. 'The battle is the LORD's: 'and the LORD muſtereth the hoſt of the battle.'‖ Theſe examples, of Pharaoh, the Egyptians and Canaanites, apply to all like caſes among men. It is clear from theſe examples, that it is God who hardens the hearts of all men, whenever their hearts are hardened. Again, of *antichriſt* and his apoſtates with him, it is ſaid, 'God ſhall ſend them ſtrong deluſion, that they ſhould be-'lieve a lie: That they all might be damned who believed not 'the truth, but had pleaſure in unrighteouſneſs.'¶ Of the Jews, becauſe

* Acts 14. 20. † Rom. 1. 24, 26, 28. ‡ Exod. 4. 21.
§ Joſh. 11. 20. ‖ 1 Sam. 17. 47. and Iſai. 13. 4. ¶ 2 Theſſ. 2. 11, 12.

becauſe they openly rejected the preaching of Chriſt and the apoſtles, it is ſaid, 'Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but 'underſtand not; and ſee ye indeed, but perceive not. Make 'the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and ſhut 'their eyes; leſt they ſee with their eyes, and hear with their 'ears, and underſtand with their heart, and convert, and be heal-'ed.'* Theſe caſes are not peculiar to antichriſt and the apoſtate Jews. Whenever men are given up to ſtrong deluſion, to believe a lie, that they might be damned; it is God who ſends them this deluſion. And in all caſes under the goſpel, when men ſee, but perceive not; when they hear, but underſtand not; and when their heart is waxed groſs, it is the LORD who has done this for them, in like manner as he did for the Jews. Men are alſo active in ſhutting their own eyes and hardening their own hearts. Nothing can be plainer than our entire freedom. Theſe things come to paſs by the governing power of God, yet the ſin belongs wholly to men, and is wholly their free act. The Jews cloſed their eyes for themſelves, and Pharaoh hardened his own heart.

But here we behold a world of ſin. Far the greateſt part is ſunk in pagan darkneſs; given over to a reprobate mind. Far the greateſt part of the chriſtian world, ſo called, is antichriſtian, given up to ſtrong deluſion, to believe a lie. Where the goſpel is, in its purity, vaſtly the greateſt part is left to blindneſs of heart. The great maſs of mankind, for ſo many paſt ages, is therefore given up to ſin. And this world of ſin is a world of ſorrow—'There was written therein lamentations, and mourning, and 'woe.'† All this is not, however, by mere chance. The overruling hand of God is viſible, in bringing of it to paſs. Hence, it is the will and determination of God, that the death of Chriſt ſhould not, as yet, profit a ruined world, or make the body of mankind happy: certainly not while they continue in this life. As to the happineſs of men, while in this life, the death of Chriſt has been almoſt wholly in vain. And God has decreed it ſhould be ſo.

3. The good ends God has to anſwer by the ſin and miſery which are in the world. And God has given us to underſtand the reaſon, why he ſuffers ſin and miſery to go on in this manner. Rom. ix. 17. 'For the ſcripture ſaith unto Pharaoh, Even for 'this ſame purpoſe have I raiſed thee up, that I might ſhow my 'power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout 'all the earth.' The apoſtle cites this as a general reaſon, or to ſhow why God ſuffers ſin and miſery in general, at all times and places,

* Iſai. 6. 9, 10. and ſee Mark 4. 12. † Ezek. 2. 10.

places to go on among men. Now God declares his name by diſplaying his power, his holineſs and juſtice, in the puniſhment of Pharaoh. In contraſt with this, he diſplays his mercy to Iſrael. This caſe of Pharaoh, uſed by the apoſtle in this general ſenſe, does therefore ſhow how God declares his holineſs and juſtice, by all the evils he ſends on his enemies, and by all the evils there are in the world. The ſame idea is kept in view throughout the ſcriptures. All the evils and judgments ſent on a wicked world, are to convince the world that God is righteous, God is holy; a ſin-hating and ſin-avenging God. And why he ſuffers ſin to go on among men, is, oftentimes, that they might fill up the meaſure of their iniquity, and fit themſelves for the appointed judgment; which is to be inflicted upon them in this world.

Thus, from a ſtriking fact, conſtantly before our eyes, we ſee how the fruits of the atonement are loſt, and Chriſt dead in vain, relative to the multitude of mankind; verily while they are in this life. We alſo ſee the will and counſel of God herein, and the good ends God anſwers by this event. This anſwers the queſtion, Why ſhould proviſion be made for the whole, and only part benefited by this proviſion? Why is the death of Chriſt ſufficient to ſave all men, when but part are to be ſaved? How is divine conduct herein conſiſtent?—Every thing God does is conſiſtent, whether in heaven, earth, or hell. One thing he does on earth, is to *make all things ready* in the goſpel; which would be ſufficient to make the whole world happy, like the joyous gueſts at the wedding of a king's ſon. Many, however, are called, but few choſen. The world is left in ſin and miſery, notwithſtanding the rich proviſion Chriſt has made. At the ſame time, God has ordained it ſhould be ſo, to anſwer the purpoſes of wiſdom.

But if God declares his great name, if he glorifies his juſtice, here in time, notwithſtanding full atonement; what reaſon can be given why he ſhould not glorify his juſtice to eternity?—'The preſent ſufferings of mankind are an unanſwerable proof 'that, however perfect the atonement be, in the divine view, all 'the valuable ends of puniſhment are not actually anſwered by 'it. For if it would be inconſiſtent with full atonement, for 'God to bring evils on men, in the future world; it would be 'equally inconſiſtent, for him to bring evils on them, in the 'preſent. If on account of the atonement, juſtice demands an 'exemption from all puniſhment in the next world; it equally 'demands it in this. It is therefore evident, from fact, whatev-

'er

'er diſplays of divine righteouſneſs and anger were made in the 'ſufferings of Chriſt; that all the purpoſes of divine benevo-'lence cannot be anſwered without a diſplay of the ſame glori-'ous attributes in a variety of evils brought upon men. And 'if it may ſubſerve the purpoſes of divine benevolence to bring 'evils on men in this world; we can by no means be certain 'that it will not ſubſerve the ſame glorious purpoſes, to inflict 'evils upon them in the next. If temporary evils may anſwer 'valuable ends in the government of God, we cannot be certain 'that eternal ones may not alſo. If *evils* are neceſſary to the 'fulleſt diſplay of divine glory, we have no ſufficient authority 'from the *atonement* to deny that they always will be neceſſary. 'If atonement doth not prevent their *preſent* neceſſity and uſe; 'we have no evidence that it will their future.'*

From the promiſed ſatisfaction for ſin by the Meſſiah, it appears that Adam might have argued the prevention of all ſin and miſery, in this world, as well as univerſaliſts do the final ſalvation of all men, in the next. Facts afterwards proved to Adam that ſin was not wholly taken away, and that puniſhment would ſtill be of uſe, however complete was the promiſed ſatisfaction for ſin. And God ſoon revealed awful curſes to be ſent on the wicked, in the preſent world. He has alſo revealed more awful curſes, even eternal curſes to be executed on wicked men, in the world to come.

The objector will now ſay, Complete diſplays of divine juſtice were made by the ſufferings of Chriſt, and no more diſplays need be made, neither are they ever made by the ſufferings of men. Conſequently, all the evils brought on men, in this world, are tokens of God's tender mercy, and ſuited to fit the ſubject for higher degrees of happineſs, in the next.

This objection is a direct contradiction to ſcripture. Pharaoh and others of like character are, throughout, ſtiled enemies to God, and God an avenging God and enemy to them. Thus in Moſes' ſong, Exod. xv. 6, 7. 'Thy right hand, O LORD, is 'become glorious in power; thy right hand, O LORD, hath 'daſhed in pieces *the enemy*. And in the greatneſs of thine ex-'cellency thou haſt overthrown them that roſe up againſt thee: 'thou ſenteſt forth thy wrath, which conſumed them as ſtubble.' And Pſal. xxxvii. 20. 'The wicked ſhall periſh, and *the ene-'mies* of the LORD ſhall be as the fat of lambs: they ſhall con-'ſume; into ſmoke ſhall they conſume away.' And thoſe words in 2 Pet. ii. 12. 'But theſe, as natural brute beaſts, made to be 'taken and deſtroyed.' From which it is plain that the enemies of

* Dr. Steph. Weſt's Examination, p. 142.

of the LORD are ſometimes, in this world, made a ſacrifice; as the lamb upon the altar, which conſumes away into ſmoke. They are ſacrificed for the good of God's people. Pſal. lxxiv. 14. 'Thou (God) gaveſt him (Pharaoh) to be meat to the people inhabiting the wilderneſs.' This ſacrifice does not, in the leaſt degree, atone for the ſins of Iſrael, or prevent their being puniſhed for their own ſins. But it illuſtrates divine hatred to ſin, and extols divine juſtice. This gives *meat*, this gives ſolid comfort to the friends of God. They have no pleaſure in the death of the wicked; but they rejoice to ſee divine, infinite hatred diſplayed againſt ſin. For this purpoſe the wicked are made a ſacrifice, and are given to be *meat* and *drink* to the righteous, as well as the body and blood of Chriſt. This is a truth clearly revealed throughout the bible. As in Rev. xviii. 20. 'Rejoice 'over her, thou heaven, and ye holy apoſtles and prophets; for 'God hath avenged you on her,' on myſtical Babylon. It is one main ſource of joy to the righteous, to ſee the name of God declared, and his injured juſtice avenged, in all the earth. Theſe and many other things give concluſive evidence that divine juſtice is glorified by the ſufferings of men, in this world, as well as by the ſufferings of Chriſt. Beſides, to ſuppoſe that all the evils brought on men, in the preſent ſtate, are nothing but tokens of divine mercy, is only confounding *the curſe* with *the bleſſing*, as we have ſeen in Part II.

The other part of the objection is, that all the evils which come on men, here, are only ſuited to fit the ſubject for higher degrees of happineſs hereafter. Which contains the following abſurdities. Firſt, as it makes no diſtinction between the friends and enemies of God, and his conduct towards them, ſo it makes *the bleſſing* and *the curſe* both one. Secondly, as it denies all uſe of evils on men, whereby to vindicate divine juſtice, and holds them to be only ſuited to fit the ſubject for higher degrees of happineſs, ſo it holds theſe evils to be *neceſſary* to fit the ſubject, and without which the ſubject could not be fitted, for higher degrees of happineſs. But if evils are thus neceſſary, in this world, to fit ſome men for higher degrees of happineſs, it belongs to the objector to ſhow why evils will not be neceſſary, in the coming world, to fit the ſame men for higher degrees of happineſs. And whether the happineſs of ſuch men can ever be increaſed without evils inflicted upon them, ſo theſe evils be forever neceſſary to increaſe their happineſs. Or, it belongs to the objector to ſhow, how theſe men can ever arrive to higher degrees of happineſs than they now poſſeſs. Thirdly, it argues that the power of the holy Spirit, or of divine grace, is not ſufficient to ſanctify

the

the hearts of ſome men, in this world, conſiſtent with their liberty; and therefore what ſcripture calls the *curſe* muſt be taken into the account, to fit them for heaven. How this agrees with *inexhauſtible grace*, and that grace which is not only able, but certainly will ſave all men, is left with the objector.

III. Divine conduct in the final perdition of ſome men, notwithſtanding full atonement, is illuſtrated and made to appear conſiſtent, by what God did towards thoſe Iſraelites, who came with Moſes out of Egypt and periſhed in the wilderneſs. For this generation that came with Moſes out of Egypt, God made every preparation on his part; or, in goſpel language, *all things were made ready* for them, to go in and poſſeſs the land of Canaan. This is evident from the whole ſeries of the event, concerning them whoſe carcaſes fell in the wilderneſs. Eſpecially this is evident from what the ſpies did and ſaid, when they returned from ſearching the land. This we find in Numb. xiii. 30, 31. and xiv. 2, 3, 6—10. 'And Caleb ſtilled the people before Moſes, and ſaid, Let us go up at once, and poſſeſs it; for we are well able to overcome it. And the men that went up with him ſaid, We be not able to go up againſt the people; for they are ſtronger than we. And they brought up an evil report of the land which they had ſearched.—And all the children of Iſrael murmured againſt Moſes and againſt Aaron; and the whole congregation ſaid unto them, Would God that we had died in the land of Egypt? or would God we had died in this wilderneſs! And wherefore hath the LORD brought us unto this land, to fall by the ſword, that our wives, and our children ſhould be a prey? Were it not better for us to return into Egypt?—And Joſhua the ſon of Nun, and Caleb the ſon of Jephunneh, which were of them that ſearched the land, rent their clothes: And they ſpake unto all the company of the children of Iſrael, ſaying, The land which we paſſed through, to ſearch it, is an exceeding good land. If the LORD delight in us, then he will bring us into this land, and give it us; a land which floweth with milk and honey. Only rebel not ye againſt the LORD, neither fear ye the people of the land: for they are bread for us: their defence is departed from them, and the LORD is with us; fear them not.'—The whole congregation of Iſrael had the ſame opportunity, and the ſame reaſon and motives, to have put on courage, and believed, and hoped, and truſted in God alone, as Caleb and Joſhua had. The whole body of Iſrael therefore had the beſt encouragement, and had nothing more to do, but to 'go up at once' and poſſeſs the good land. Inſtead

of

of this, 'All the congregation bade ſtone Joſhua and Caleb with 'ſtones.' Who can theſe rebels blame, at the judgment day, but themſelves?

But we have again the ſame things brought to view, and in the moſt ſtriking manner. It is impoſſible to diſpute the freedom and ill-deſert of theſe rebels. The rich proviſion made for them, and made by the atoning righteouſneſs of the Meſſiah, is alſo ſtrikingly evident. They were brought upon the borders of Canaan. They had ſearched the land. They had found it to be a land flowing with milk and honey. They had brought back a cluſter of grapes of the fruit of the land. Defence was departed from the Canaanites. The Canaanites had become *bread* for Iſrael. God himſelf was on Iſrael's ſide. And the holy Spirit was ſtriving with them; ready to ſtrengthen and encourage them, and animate their hearts, to go in and take the promiſed land. But, No! Let us chooſe a captain, and let us return into Egypt. Let us ſtone Joſhua and Caleb with ſtones!

Becauſe God had not given them an heart to obey his voice and to truſt in him, this Moſes charges againſt them as being wholly their blame, and an evidence of their ſin. 'And Moſes 'called unto all Iſrael, and ſaid unto them, Ye have ſeen all that 'the LORD did before your eyes in the land of Egypt, unto Pha-'raoh, and unto all his ſervants, and unto all his land; The great 'temptations which thine eyes have ſeen, the ſigns, and thoſe 'great miracles: Yet the LORD *hath not given you an heart 'to perceive, and eyes to ſee, and ears to hear* unto this day.'* It was therefore free for all Iſrael, at this time and at all times, to waſh their hearts from wickedneſs, or to depend on free grace for new hearts—to depend on the holy Spirit, as the moving cauſe, to work in them *both to will and to do* of his good pleaſure. Thus were they ſtriped of every excuſe, and their blame laid open to the world.†

Again, the overruling hand of divine wiſdom, in this event, is equally evident. His counſel ſtands, and he does all his pleaſure. As God raiſed up Pharaoh to anſwer his own purpoſe, ſo he raiſed up theſe apoſtate Iſraelites, to anſwer the ſame purpoſe for which divine wiſdom finally devoted them. God caſt off theſe rebels, and ſware in his wrath, 'They ſhall not enter 'into my reſt,'‡ but ſhall die in the wilderneſs. In conſequence

* Deut. 29. 2, 3, 4. ‡ Heb. 3. 11.

† At the preſent day of moſt daring wickedneſs, it is common for men to invent a cobweb-covering for their ſin, becauſe God has not given them *eyes to ſee, and an heart to perceive.* How provoking, yea blaſphemous, are ſuch excuſes, which are made right in the face of ſcripture? As early as the days of Moſes, the blame reſted wholly on man, and on all Iſrael, becauſe God had not given them holy hearts.

of this, all the earth was filled with his glory. 'And the LORD 'ſaid, As truly as I live, all the earth ſhall be filled with the glo- 'ry of the LORD. Becauſe all thoſe men which have ſeen my 'glory, and my miracles, which I did in Egypt and in the wil- 'derneſs, have tempted me now theſe ten times, and have not 'hearkened to my voice; Surely they ſhall not ſee the land, 'which I ſware unto their fathers, neither ſhall any of them that 'provoked me ſee it: But my ſervant Caleb, becauſe he had 'another ſpirit with him, and hath followed me fully, him will I 'bring into the land whereinto he went; and his ſeed ſhall poſ- 'ſeſs it.'*

The fall of theſe rebels is the occaſion of unſpeakable good to God's people. They are counſeled, warned, and inſtructed by it, in every age while time laſts. The ſaints in heaven will alſo improve upon it to endleſs ages. For God demonſtrated his character before the world, even on his own viſible people; that he is a jealous God, and will not clear the guilty. They could not enter into Canaan becauſe of unbelief; and when every thing elſe was made ready. On the other hand, God ſhowed his covenant-faithfulneſs and mercy to Caleb and Joſhua, by bringing them to poſſeſs the land, becauſe they wholly followed the LORD. Thus God did indeed fill all the earth with his glory. O the blindneſs! the blindneſs of ſuch as cannot ſee, that the wrath of man does always praiſe God, and the remainder of wrath he will reſtrain. And the blindneſs of ſuch as cannot ſee, how the grace of God ſtands prepared to reward the righteous, and his juſtice to puniſh the wicked.

But, if God did right in ſhutting theſe Iſraelites out of Canaan, becauſe of their unbelief, then he does right in ſhutting unbelievers out of heaven. And, if God did right in ſhutting them out of Canaan finally and forever, then he does right in ſhutting unbelievers forever out of heaven. The ſame reaſon that juſtifies divine conduct in the former caſe, juſtifies it in the latter. God had made all things ready for their entrance into Canaan, and made things ready by virtue of full atonement. But becauſe of their unbelief they were forever excluded the land of promiſe. Which argues the rectitude of divine conduct in ſhutting unbelievers forever out of heaven. What places this matter beyond diſpute, the apoſtle argues it in the ſame manner. Heb. iii. iv. 'Take heed, brethren, leſt there be in any of you an evil heart 'of unbelief, in departing from the living God. But exhort 'one another daily, while it is called To day.—While it is ſaid, 'To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in 'the

* Numb. 14. 21—24.

'the provocation, (in the day of temptation in the wilderneſs). 'For ſome, when they had heard did provoke: howbeit not all 'that came out of Egypt by Moſes. But with whom was he 'grieved forty years? was it not with them that had ſinned, 'whoſe carcaſes fell in the wilderneſs? And, To whom ſware 'he that they ſhould not enter into his reſt, but to them that be-'lieved not? So we ſee that they could not enter in becauſe of 'unbelief. Let us therefore fear, leſt a promiſe being left us of 'entering into his reſt, any of you ſhould ſeem to come ſhort of 'it.' This *reſt*, laſt mentioned, is the eternal reſt in heaven, as he afterwards ſhows. And the whole force of his warning and exhortation is grounded on this; as unbelief cut them off from the earthly reſt or from Canaan, ſo unbelief utterly cuts men off from the heavenly reſt. He alſo ſhows directly, in the ſame connection, that it is impoſſible for unbelievers to enter heaven, or eſcape perdition. 'How ſhall we eſcape, if we neglect ſo 'great ſalvation?' Implying that there are, in this caſe, no means left, or poſſible way of eſcape. As he aſſerts in another place, in this Epiſtle, 'There remaineth no more ſacrifice for ſins.' When this takes effect, and the ſinner is entirely cut off from the ſacrifice of Chriſt's blood, is decided by the above words. 'To day'—'While it is called To day'—'To day if ye will hear 'his voice, harden not your hearts.' *To day* is while time laſts, The expreſſion urges us to preſent duty, as we have no aſſurance of futurity. It likewiſe determines what is meant by our day, and only day of ſalvation. As when Chriſt ſaid, 'I muſt work 'the works of him that ſent me, while it is day: the night com-'eth, when no man can work.'* This *night*, which thus cloſes up the day, can be no other than death or the grave. The wiſe man ſays, 'There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor 'wiſdom, in the grave, whether thou goeſt.'† There is nothing done after death, which can alter or change our ſtate; but every man's ſtate is then unalterably fixed for eternity. *The day*, or *while it is called To day*, is of courſe our period of life and only day of grace. For ſuch therefore as die neglecting the 'great 'ſalvation,' there remaineth no more ſacrifice for their ſins. Such as die in unbelief, do forever come ſhort of the *heavenly reſt*. And divine conduct, in this moſt awful event, is illuſtrated and vindicated by the fate of thoſe unbelievers who came ſhort of the *earthly reſt*.

Again, we ſee how evil is the occaſion of good. A ſore evil the LORD ſent on thoſe apoſtates. Diſtinguiſhed by birth, children of Abraham, heirs of promiſe, heirs of Canaan; ſaved by the

* John 9. 4. † Eccl. 9. 10.

the LORD, ſaved from the hand of Pharaoh, ſaved by ſigns and wonders, ſaved by an outſtretched arm; guarded by angels, defended by a wall of fire, fed with manna from heaven and water from the rock; devoted to God by circumciſion, carrying the oracles of God with them, carrying his ark and his teſtimony; juſt ready to go in and poſſeſs *the land of reſt*, the garden of God and type of heaven: under theſe circumſtances to be barred entirely from *entering in*, and made to wander forty years in the wilderneſs, till they were *all conſumed and dead*, this muſt have been a very great evil. Not only ſo, they were made to the world and to all ages examples of divine vengeance. But the good ariſing out of this evil vaſtly outweighs the evil. The good is far greater than the evil. The evil fell only on one generation, and no injuſtice was done to them, they can blame none but themſelves. Whereas the advantage from it to the whole church of God, whether in heaven or in earth, is from generation to generation; while time laſts and to eternity. Eſpecially the advantage of having demonſtrative evidence that God is an holy or jealous God, this is a ſource of endleſs good to all who truly love him.

But if God does this here in time, by judgments on unbelievers, why not the ſame in eternity? God is as able to do the ſame in eternity as he is in time. He is able to make the good overbalance the evil in one caſe as well as the other. The eternal miſery of the damned may ſo enhance the joy of heaven, that it may be beſt and deſirable, on the whole, that this miſery ſhould take place. God is as able to make it ſo, as to do what he has already done in this world. He demonſtrates the holineſs of his nature anſwerable to the evil he inflicts on tranſgreſſors. He does this alſo conſiſtently with full atonement. The ſame he is able to do in eternity as well as in time, and with the ſame conſiſtency. Hence no objection can ariſe nor argument be drawn from divine goodneſs or from full atonement; but what will oblige us to take the awful threatenings of everlaſting puniſhment in their literal ſenſe. Divine goodneſs ſhut thoſe rebels out of Canaan. The ſame divine goodneſs can caſt ſinners down to endleſs woe. Conſiſtently with full atonement they were forever ſhut out of Canaan, becauſe of unbelief. Conſiſtently with full atonement unbelievers will be forever ſhut out of heaven, and thruſt down to hell. In the ſame manner we have ſeen theſe things illuſtrated and confirmed by the apoſtle. 'Let us therefore fear, leſt a promiſe being left us of entering into his reſt, any of you ſhould ſeem to come ſhort of it.—

'Take

'Take heed, brethren, leſt there be in any of you an evil heart 'of unbelief, in departing from the living God.'*

IV. When the Chaldean army came to beſiege Jeruſalem, in the days of Zedekiah king of Judah, the word of the LORD to his people by Jeremiah was, 'Behold I ſet before you the way 'of life, and the way of death. He, that abideth in this city, 'ſhall die by the ſword, and by the famine, and by the peſti-'lence: but he, that goeth out and falleth to the Chaldeans that 'beſiege you, he ſhall live, and his life ſhall be unto him for a 'prey.' In this moſt critical and trying moment, the LORD made proviſion for every man to ſave his own life. In connection with this, the prophet Ezekiel was ſent to them with theſe words, 'Have I any pleaſure at all that the wicked ſhould 'die? ſaith the LORD God: and not that he ſhould return from 'his ways and live?—Caſt away from you all your tranſ-'greſſions, whereby ye have tranſgreſſed; and make you a new 'heart and a new ſpirit: for, why will ye die, O houſe of Iſ-'rael? For I have no pleaſure in the death of him that dieth, 'ſaith the Lord God: wherefore turn yourſelves, and live ye.'

This untimely death, which they are ſo warned againſt and entreated to eſcape, this is ſet forth to illuſtrate the eternal death of ſinners. And univerſaliſts themſelves allow this to be evidence that God has no pleaſure in their eternal death. But, multitudes of thoſe hardened Jews did die by the ſword of the Chaldeans, and by famine, and by peſtilence. And died in rebellion againſt the word of the LORD, even when he had made every preparation for their eſcape, alſo warned and entreated them to turn and live. This removes all ground of objection as to the eternal death of the wicked, becauſe God has no pleaſure in it.

He had no pleaſure in their temporal death. They however did die this death. Therefore they may die an eternal death, although God has no pleaſure in it. Eſpecially as their dying in this awful manner by the ſword, by the famine, and by the peſtilence, was a repreſentation of eternal death.

Under thoſe terrible judgments and frowns of heaven, the Jews complained and ſaid, 'The way of the LORD is not equal.'†

But God proved his way to be equal, by making proviſion for each man to ſave his life, by entreating them to turn and live, by declaring he had no pleaſure in their death, and by making a difference between the righteous and the wicked. God proved his way to be equal by ſaving the righteous and deſtroying the wicked; whereby he ſanctified his great name among the heathen.‡

It

* Heb. 4, 1. † Ezek. 18, 25. ‡ Ezek. 36, 23.

It becomes univerſaliſts to enquire candidly, whether they do not call the way of the Lord unequal. One material argument of theirs is, that endleſs puniſhment is inconſiſtent with divine goodneſs, or inconſiſtent with divine compaſſion. And for this plain reaſon, as they ſay, becauſe God has no pleaſure in the death of the wicked, or in their eternal death. This is the ſame as ſaying that it was inconſiſtent and unequal for God to deſtroy thoſe perverſe Jews with the ſword of the Chaldeans; when, at the ſame time, he had no pleaſure in their death. It is a fact, God did thus deſtroy them, when he had no pleaſure in their deſtruction. And their deſtruction by the ſword was given to repreſent eternal death. If therefore the latter is inconſiſtent and unequal, ſo is the former. If the endleſs death of ſinners is unequal, then that awful death by ſword and famine, which illuſtrates endleſs death, is unequal.——'Behold, I ſet 'before you the way of life, and the way of death.' It is impoſſible to ſay that this does not ſet forth and repreſent endleſs life and endleſs death. Univerſaliſts themſelves allow it does. Let them attend but a moment, and they muſt alſo allow that many did die this terrible death, by the ſword, by the peſtilence, or by the famine, which does very ſtrikingly illuſtrate the everlaſting torments of the damned. And that they died, in this terrible manner, rebelling againſt the word of the Lord;—and when the Lord had made proviſion for them to ſave their lives, and declared he had no pleaſure in their death. This example is therefore right againſt univerſaliſts, inſtead of being in their favor. God actually does inflict that kind of temporal death, which he has no pleaſure in, ſo he may inflict that eternal death, in which he has no pleaſure. He ſends upon the wicked ſore judgments, as he had threatened to do. He cuts down hardened rebels, in the midſt of their rebellion, as he publicly declared he would do. Theſe things confirm all the awful threatenings to the wicked, which will aſſuredly be executed upon them in hell, unleſs they turn and live.

V. Concerning the hardhearted Jews in his time, Chriſt ſaid, 'O Jeruſalem, Jeruſalem, thou that killeſt the prophets, and 'ſtoneſt them which are ſent unto thee, how often would I have 'gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her 'chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold your 'houſe is left unto you deſolate.'* Again, 'When ye ſhall ſee 'Jeruſalem compaſſed with armies, then know that the deſola-'tion thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judea flee to 'the mountains; and let them which are in the midſt of it de-

'part

* Matt. 23, 20, 24, 22

'part out; and let not them that are in the countries enter 'there into. For theſe be the days of vengeance, that all things 'which are written may be fulfilled.'* Though this laſt was ſpoken to his diſciples, and for their particular benefit, yet the whole nation either did or might have known it. It was becauſe they refuſed to hear if they were ignorant of this warning. But it cannot be denied that the Jews had every poſſible warning, and opportunity to eſcape *theſe days of vengeance*; and that the death of Chriſt made proviſion for this purpoſe, ſo as nothing ſtood in the way of their eſcape but the wickedneſs of their hearts. Beſides, when *theſe days* actually came, divine providence then gave them the beſt opportunities. Titus, the general of the Roman *armies* or army, Chriſt alluded to above, was a man noted for his mildneſs of temper, as well as for his military ſkill. And as he was ſent to bring the revolting Jews back under the Roman government, ſo he eagerly ſought, for his own honor, to preſerve Jeruſalem and the temple entire.—He therefore, when he ſurrounded the city, improved every occurrence and perſuaſion to bring the inhabitants to honorable terms of peace. For this end he ſent Joſephus, their countryman, again and again, to offer them their lives, liberties, and fortunes. But all in vain; Joſephus and the terms he brought were only treated with ſcorn. Titus, however, as though he were deaf to their inſults, when he had taken the ſecond wall of the city, and was about to make a breach in the third and laſt, firſt gave them one more generous offer. And when he had advanced ſo far as to take the tower of Antonia, the laſt defence of the temple and two chief diviſions of the city, he even then repeated the ſame kind offer. And when he entered the upper diviſion, which decided the fate of this devoted place, nothing but their daring inſults prevented *giving his right hand*, or granting them pardon. Now when Titus had theſe wretched Jews completely in his power, and when unheard of evils and barbarities among themſelves, had reduced them to the utmoſt ſtraits, their refuſal of his laſt offer did but declare to the world their horrid madneſs. But theſe repeated offers, which providence gave them, witneſſed to the univerſe the love and pity the compaſſionate Redeemer bore towards them. Theſe offers of aſtoniſhing kindneſs declared the ſame bowels of mercy as when Chriſt wept over them; and that he had freely given his life a ranſom to deliver them; *but they would not!* This raſhneſs and madneſs of the Jews in refuſing, ſo repeatedly, to ſave their

* Luke 21, 20, 21, 22.

their natural lives, alſo illuſtrates tha fool-hardineſs of ſinners; who, time and again, reject immortal life.

But the juſtice of God is one thing remarkable, in this place. And the evils brought on theſe miſerable wretches, the Jews, did not exceed their crimes. The whole body of them, with few exceptions, had grown up to the moſt enormous height of wickedneſs. It was not a groundleſs opinion, when Joſephus ſaid, 'That neither did any other city ever ſuffer ſuch miſeries, 'nor did any age ever breed a generation more fruitful in wick-'edneſs than this was from the beginning of the world.'* 'It 'brought forth a generation of men much more atheiſtical than 'the Sodomites.'† Neither was it mere aſſertion for Titus to repreſent them as the greateſt monſters of iniquity, the ſun ever before ſhined upon.‡ Their cruelty and ſavage brutality towards each other, while they were ſhut up by the ſiege, far exceeded every thing that went before. But the evils they ſuffered from the Romans, eſpecially from one another, were a fulfilment of Chriſt's words. 'Then ſhall be great tribulation, ſuch 'as was not ſince the beginning of the world to this time; no, nor ever ſhall be.'§ All former evils were, ſeemingly, a ſhadow compared to theſe. So that theſe were eminently *days of vengeance;* as God before threatened by Moſes, 'I will heap 'miſchiefs upon them; I will ſpend mine arrows upon them.'¶ The awful judgments of heaven were, in a ſenſe, combined together. The greateſt of all judgments, which is the famine, carried off upwards of one million. What aggravated this evil, in their rage againſt each other, they burnt down, with their own hands, their principal ſtores of proviſion; and this juſt before the entire nation was ſhut up in the city, by Titus. The famine, therefore, roſe to ſuch a degree, that they were burnt with hunger, and devoured with burning heat and with bitter deſtruction. Then was alſo fulfilled that moſt doleful prediction, That tender and delicate women ſhould eat their own infants which they bare, and for the want of all things, eat them *ſecretly;*‖ in the utmoſt fear leſt even this, horridly unnatural food, would be ſnatched from them, by others that were burnt with the ſame hunger. But when God thus heaped miſchiefs upon them, and ſpent his arrows upon them, it was no more than anſwerable to their crimes; it was but deſtroying theſe monſters, which the earth would no longer bear. The good of mankind, and the long abuſed patience of God, evidently required their deſtruction. In this light it was taken by the neighboring

* Jew. war, B. V. Ch. 10. † Ibid, Ch. 13. ‡ See Ibid, B. VI, 6, 3. § Matt. 24, 21.
¶ Deut. 32, 23. ‖ Deut. 28, 56, 57.

neighboring nations, and by the whole world. Even Titus, an idolater, after he had taken the city, ſaid, 'We have certainly 'had God for our aſſiſtant in this war, and it was no other than 'God who ejected the Jews out of theſe fortifications; for what 'could the hands of men do towards overthrowing theſe tow-'ers?'* And when the neighboring nations offered Titus the moſt honorable preſents, for ſubduing and deſtroying the Jews in the manner he did, he ſaid, 'He was not worthy of ſuch an 'honor, nor had he himſelf done that great work. He had on-'ly lent his hand to the ſervice of God, when he was pleaſed 'to ſhew his diſpleaſure.'†

All theſe things came upon the Jews, as was foretold ſhould come, becauſe they killed the prophets and ſtoned them that were ſent unto them; and, to finiſh their guilt, imbrued their hands in the blood of the Son of God. Becauſe they treated Chriſt, the prophets and apoſtles in the manner they did, they were left to act out the moſt horrid cruelties among themſelves, and to all other evils they ſuffered. God brought on them, as Chriſt had foretold, all the righteous blood that had been ſhed from the foundation of the world.

God raiſed up theſe devoted wretches for this ſame purpoſe, to diſplay his vengeance upon them. 'God gave them the ſpir-'it of ſlumber, eyes that they ſhould not ſee, and ears that they 'ſhould not hear.' The Lord ſent upon them to the uttermoſt what was foretold by the prophet: 'Go, and tell this people, 'Hear ye indeed, but underſtand not; ſee ye indeed, but per-'ceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, &c.' Thus the Lord hardened their hearts. They alſo hardened their own hearts, and ripened themſelves for this deſtruction. 'But through their 'fall ſalvation is come unto the Gentiles.—The fall of them is 'the riches of the world, and the diminiſhing of them the riches 'of the Gentiles.' Divine wiſdom made their fall to be the occa-ſion of calling and building up the Gentile church. The ven-geance of heaven poured upon them, and the heavy judgment the Jews lie under to this day, for their horrid ſin againſt Chriſt and his diſciples; theſe things alſo remain a ſtanding witneſs to his people, and to the world, that Chriſt is the real Meſſiah.

This tremendous event, the overthrow of the Jews, their city and temple, is given to illuſtrate the final overthrow and doom of all the wicked, at the general judgment. Chriſt improves it for this purpoſe, as we ſee by comparing the xxivth and xxvth Chap. of Matt. together. The fearful ſigns, foreboding the

* J. War, B. VI, 6, 9. † Philoſtratus, as cited by Rev. Rel. p. 175.

deſtruction of Jeruſalem, look forward to the end of the world; or will then be acted over again. The manner of Chriſt's coming to take vengeance on the Jews, is given by the ſame figure, as when he comes to judge the world. 'As the lightning com-'eth out of the eaſt, and ſhineth even unto the weſt; ſo ſhall 'alſo the coming of the ſon of man be.'* The ſame figure in 2 Theſ. i, 8, deſcribes his coming at the judgment day. Eſpecially his gathering together his *elect* from the four winds, and ſeparating the righteous from the wicked, when Jeruſalem was deſtroyed; this ſtrikingly illuſtrates the general judgment. And there are ſeveral other circumſtances to the ſame purpoſe. As, therefore, every proviſion was made to ſave the Jews from this deſtruction, and they *would not* be ſaved from it, ſo it will appear at the final judgment. For the former illuſtrates the latter. The Jews were devoured with bitter deſtruction, divine vengeance took them away, notwithſtanding full atonement. So, at the laſt day, full atonement will appear to have been made for all on the left hand of the Judge; their own ſin, and nothing elſe, placing them in this condemnation. Then will theſe words of Chriſt apply, verily to ſuch as have had the goſpel, 'How 'often would I have gathered you! how often would I have re-'deemed you, *and ye would not!*' Then will juſtice alſo be ſeen without a covering; the great Judge convincing the world of the holineſs of his law and the evil of ſin. Divine juſtice once appeared at Jeruſalem, and that it was for the good of mankind to rid the earth of thoſe monſters of iniquity, How much more clearly will it be ſeen, and for the public good, when the Judge of all ſhall pronounce this ſentence, 'Depart from 'me, ye curſed, into everlaſting fire, prepared for the devil and 'his angels?'

Juſt before the Romans burnt down the temple, ſet Jeruſalem on fire, and ſlaughtered the Jews by thouſands, till they grew weary with killing; juſt before this awful criſis, the Jews boaſted aloud, 'That they did never fear the taking of the city, becauſe it was God's 'own city. That yet this temple would be preſerved by him that 'inhabited therein, whom they ſtill had for their aſſiſtant in this 'war.'† This they ſaid, when they were in open rebellion againſt God, even fighting againſt him with all their ſtrength. So ſinners boaſt aloud of full atonement, and that this will moſt certainly deliver them from endleſs death, and exalt them to immortal life. This they make their boaſt, even when they are trampling under foot the blood of the Son of God. Dr. Huntington, as we have

* Matt. 24, 27. † J. War, B. v, 6, 9; and B. vi, 6, 2.

have ſeen in Letter 6, Part I, takes theſe words, '*Theſe ſhall go away into everlaſting puniſhment*,' in a myſtical ſenſe ;— and to be a promiſe to all men that they ſhall, at the laſt great day, be exalted to heaven, and ſeated in eternal happineſs and glory. So might the Jews have taken all the woes and curſes denounced againſt them, by Moſes and the prophets, Chriſt and the apoſtles, in a myſtical ſenſe ; and to be promiſes of eminent proſperity, inſtead of days of vengeance ; this they might have done, and been, if poſſible, guilty of ſtill greater madneſs than they were. But when the deſtruction of the old world by a flood, the deſtruction of Sodom by fire, eſpecially the laſt deſtruction of Jeruſalem ; when theſe facts are taken to illuſtrate the final doom of the wicked, then to take the final doom of the wicked as a promiſe of good, even everlaſting good in heaven, is ſuch a groſs perverſion of common ſenſe, as can be accounted for only on this principle, *men love darkneſs rather than light*.

The important ends we now ſee, occaſioned by the caſting away of the Jews, and the evils attending this noted event. Divine juſtice is hereby vindicated before angels and men, and throughout all ages. God proves himſelf to be no reſpecter of perſons. Even his own favorite people, the children of Abraham, are not ſpared. They are judged and puniſhed according to their crimes. Providence finds out their ſin ; the world read it in their puniſhment. This anſwers an important end relative to the divine character. It is moſt important indeed for their puniſhment to find out their ſin againſt the Lord Jeſus. So as to exhibit his crucifiers and murderers to open view. When therefore, God does his ſtrange work, and brings to paſs his ſtrange act ; when he brings on them ſuch great tribulation as was not from the beginning to this time, nor ſhall be again while time laſts ; the world then enquire, 'Wherefore hath the Lord 'done this ? What meaneth the heat of this great anger ?'*— Becauſe they ſhed the blood of the prophets, and, to finiſh their guilt, ſhed the blood of the Son of God. This gives public evidence who is the Son of God. This diſtinguiſhed judgment upon them ſerves to ſhow the Saviour of men to the world. The caſting away of the Jews is of courſe the riches of the world :— As well becauſe the Meſſiah is hereby marked out to the world, as that his kingdom is transferred from the Jews to the Gentiles. The rejection of the Jews is alſo equally important in another view ; it neceſſarily precedes their being grafted again into Chriſt.

* Deut. 29, 24.

Chriſt. This will be as *life from the dead.* 'If the caſting 'away of them be the reconciling of the world, what ſhall the 'receiving of them be, but life from the dead?'* They will return, and publicly, and joyfully own him for their God and Saviour, whom they have hated and crucified. Inſtead of crowning him with thorns, they will crown him with glory and honor. The hand, and power, and wiſdom, and grace of the Redeemer, will then be ſo viſible, as that the world will know the Father hath ſent the Son. This *life from the dead*, will ariſe principally from having ſuch clear evidence that the deſpiſed Galilean is the true Meſſiah, and God over all. Thus the great good which ariſes out of evil. Again, for fallen men to have conſtantly before them in the goſpel, a repreſentative and illuſtration of the great Day of Judgment, is matter of high importance indeed. All theſe valuable ends are effected or occaſioned by the fall and overthrow of that nation. And the good which ariſes out of the evil, we ſee at once, far exceeds the evil.

Beſides, God would not ſend theſe ſore evils, eſpecially on his own viſible people, if all the ſame valuable ends could be anſwered without. God certainly would not ſo harden their hearts, or leave them to harden their own hearts, and ripen themſelves for that dreadful deſtruction, could the ſame great good be otherwiſe effected. And they have been given up to judicial blindneſs and unbelief for nearly two thouſand years.—The apoſtle Paul was deeply affected with their caſe. He had great heavineſs and continual ſorrow of heart for his kinſmen according to the fleſh. And he appears to be hardly reconciled to the awful providence, in their overthrow. Or he appears to view it as a deep myſtery, till he ſees the good ariſing out of the evil. He then breaks out in acclamations of joy and praiſe.—'Behold therefore the goodneſs and ſeverity of God; on them 'which fell ſeverity; but toward thee, goodneſs, if thou con-'tinue in his goodneſs.—For God hath concluded them all in 'unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all. O the depth of 'the riches both of the wiſdom and knowledge of God! how 'unſearchable are his judgments, and his ways paſt finding out.'†

But, if the puniſhment of the wicked, in this world, is the occaſion of good to the righteous, why not the ſame in the coming world? If the moſt awful puniſhment is ſent on the wicked, here in time, to effect the moſt important ends to the righteous, why not the ſame in eternity? If this puniſhment, in time, is alſo

* Rom. 11, 15. † Rom. 11, 22, 32, 33.

alſo neceſſary, or the ſame good could not ariſe without it, why is not puniſhment on the wicked neceſſary for the good of the righteous, in eternity? This puniſhment in this world is conſiſtent with complete atonement. This puniſhment in this world is to convince the world that complete atonement has been made, and to mark out the Meſſiah who has made it. Not only ſo, the ſame conviction and means of conviction could not be had without this puniſhment. Scripture aſſures us, the ſame moſt valuable ends will be anſwered by the endleſs puniſhment of the damned; and that theſe ends could not otherwiſe be anſwered. To give the higheſt poſſible evidence, and to make it every way clear, that Chriſt is God-man, has died, has brought in everlaſting righteouſneſs; for this, God *heaps* miſchief on his crucifiers, and *ſpends* his arrows upon them. This is given, as we have juſt ſeen, to illuſtrate to us what God does in hell. It is accordingly evident, when God pours out his wrath to the uttermoſt on the damned, it is to anſwer the ſame moſt valuable purpoſe—to make known the riches of divine glory on the veſſels of mercy.*

When atonement is made, it is neceſſary the world ſhould know it is made. The latter is as neceſſary as the former, elſe the good ends could not be effected by the atonement. What would it avail for atonement to be made, and the knowledge of it hid from the world? One great mean to communicate this knowledge is that tremendous judgment on thoſe who imbrued their hands in the blood of Chriſt. And it is certain, without this judgment poured upon them, one eſſential mean of knowledge would be wanting. To give the moſt complete knowledge of Chriſt and his death, this judgment executed, is, in its place, as neceſſary therefore, as the death of Chriſt. This judgment of courſe, becauſe neceſſary in its place, is in the higheſt ſenſe conſiſtent with full atonement. Which clearly argues the miſery of the damned to be neceſſary in its place, and therefore in the higheſt ſenſe conſiſtent with full atonement.—For this awful judgment on the Jews is given as a ſtriking image or repreſentation of a more awful judgment on the damned. As the former was neceſſary for the end juſt ſtated, ſo is the latter. The neceſſity of the image or repreſentation determines the neceſſity of the thing repreſented. Not only ſo, when God executes upon the damned, it is directly ſaid, he does it 'to 'ſhow his wrath, and to make his power known.'† And when the ſmoke of their torment aſcendeth up, the ſaints in heaven behold

* Rom. 9, 23. † Rom. 9, 22.

behold it, and aſcribe unto God and the Lamb, 'Salvation, and glory, and honor, and power.'* Thus the greatneſs of the puniſhment *heaped* on thoſe in hell, who have deſpiſed Chriſt on earth, is one neceſſary mean to make known more diſtinctly in heaven who is the Meſſiah; as well the infinite worthineſs, dignity, and glory of his perſon. What is more conſiſtent with complete atonement than for Chriſt to reveal, in every ſenſe, his own divine fullneſs? And what more conſiſtent than the neceſſary means to effect the deſired end?

VI. Another fact pertinent to our preſent purpoſe is the caſe of Judas. None can deny that this traitor had equal means and advantages with the reſt of the apoſtles; and that the atonement opened the way of ſalvation for him as well as for the reſt. But Judas is called the ſon of perdition: 'None of them is loſt, but 'the ſon of perdition.'† Now if he was put into a *purgatory* ſtate, immediately after death, as Dr. Chauncy pretends, he could not be loſt. If death placed him in a ſecond ſtate of probation, one far better for obſtinate ſinners than the preſent, he could not then be called 'the ſon of perdition.' *Perdition* ſtands oppoſed to *ſalvation*, or it has no meaning. Unleſs Dr. C. allows this, it is vain for him to tell of ſalvation. Should he ſay, Chriſt came to ſave that which is *loſt*, which includes all men; the above words of Chriſt declare the oppoſite as to one man.

But here it is remarkable, Judas 'by tranſgreſſion fell' from the ſame diſtinguiſhed gifts and graces, as thoſe mentioned in Heb. vi, 4, 5, 6. Theſe had taſted of the heavenly gift, and of the good word of God. *Taſted* as Balaam did; and as the ſtony ground hearers, who had no root in themſelves. Theſe alſo were made partakers of the powers of the world to come, of the *coming age* or goſpel ſtate; and partakers of the Holy Ghoſt; that is, they had received miraculous gifts. All which agrees with the caſe of Judas. As Judas, however, received part of the miniſtry and apoſtleſhip with the other eleven, ſo he is placed at the head of theſe apoſtates; noted with this character, *the ſon of perdition*. This caſe of his proves it to be a fact, that ſome do 'fall away,' ſo as 'it is impoſſible to renew them again unto repentance.' This is further manifeſt from the 7th and 8th verſes of Heb. vi. 'For the earth which drinketh in 'the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet 'for them by whom it is dreſſed, receiveth bleſſing from God: 'But that which beareth thorns and briars is rejected, and is 'nigh

* Rev. 19, 3. † John, 17. 12.

'nigh unto curſing; whoſe end is to be burned.' This is taking of it for granted that thoſe apoſtates did then exiſt. See again, verſe 9th: 'But, beloved, we are perſuaded better things 'of you, and things that accompany ſalvation.' Theſe latter had, or appeared to have, grace in their hearts, things which accompany ſalvation. Therefore the apoſtle was perſuaded they never would fall away, after the manner of the former.

This interpretation of theſe texts in Hebrews, it is well known, is denied. Some divines, allowed to be well acquainted with ſcripture, hold that the apoſtle is here ſpeaking hypothetically or making a ſuppoſition of a caſe, which, at the ſame time, never exiſts. That is, if true believers in Chriſt ſhould *fall away*; whereas they never do, it would be impoſſible to *renew* them *again* unto repentance.* This ſenſe of the paſſage, to ſay the leaſt, appears to be embarraſſed. Should this be granted, however, to be the apoſtle's meaning, ſtill the ſame is ſaid of Ahithophel and Judas; they cannot be renewed unto repentance.—'Add iniquity unto their iniquity; and let them not come into 'thy righteouſneſs. Let them be blotted out of the book of the 'living; and not written with the righteous. Let their eyes be 'darkened that they ſee not. Pour out thine indignation upon 'them; and let thy wrathful anger take hold of them.—Let 'there be none to extend mercy unto him. When he ſhall be 'judged, let him be condemned; and let his prayer become 'ſin.'† Thus David prays to the Lord againſt his enemies.—Which prayer is interpreted in the New Teſtament as a prophecy againſt Ahithophel and Judas; and was executed upon them. They therefore are paſt all recovery. They are cut off from divine mercy, *none to extend mercy unto them;* being given over to the *wrathful anger* of almighty God. It is alſo impoſſible to renew them by the ſpirit of grace. *Let them not come into thy righteouſneſs. When he ſhall be judged, let him be condemned;* or, as in the margin, when he ſhall be tried by ſore judgments, let him go out guilty or wicked; *and let his prayer become ſin.* Agreeably to Chriſt's words, 'He 'that ſhall blaſpheme againſt the Holy Ghoſt, hath *never* forgiveneſs.'‡ The plain language is, their *prayer* ſhall *never* be any

* Repentance often means outward reformation. 'The men of Nineveh repented;' the whole body of them outwardly reformed. From this ſort of repentance, or from external righteouſneſs, men may *fall*; but from ſaving grace, or evangelical repentance they never do *fall*. Therefore, this ſuppoſed *renewing again* unto repentance does not prove that they before had penitent hearts; nothing can be argued from this mode of ſpeaking.

† Pſal. 69, 23, 27, 28, and, 109, 7, 12. ‡ Mark 3, 29.

any other than *ſin*—They ſhall *never* come into Chriſt's righteouſneſs, or be clothed with his righteouſneſs—They ſhall *never*, to eternity, be renewed by the Holy Ghoſt. Theſe traitors, being claſſed with ſuch as commit the unpardonable ſin, have this moſt awful ſentence paſſed upon them while they are ſtill living.

Thus ſcripture aſſures us, ſome men, among whom Judas ſtands at the head, are, even before they depart this life, irrecoverably loſt. They cannot poſſibly be ſaved by the renewing of the Holy Ghoſt. Their end is to be burned. Their final ſtate is a ſtate of moſt exquiſite torment. Their doom, ſo inexpreſſibly dreadful, is pronounced upon them while they remain in this world. And Judas's torment began in this world, in ſome degree. Becauſe he had betrayed the innocent blood, his conſcience ſo pierced him, and preyed upon him, that he was driven to lay violent hands on himſelf, and thus put an end to his own wretched life by another horridly wicked deed. In oppoſition to the whole word of God, ſome men have the hardineſs to ſay, As none ever returned from hell, to give an account of that place, and as it is wholly inviſible to mortal eyes; ſo we have no certain knowledge about it; and it is vain to talk of that we know little or nothing about. But the caſe of Judas, and other like caſes, give us as ſtriking a reſemblance of hell torments, as can be of ſervice to us in this world.

The impoſſibility of renewing theſe apoſtates to repentance does not, however, ariſe from ſome deficiency in the atonement. No ſin can be ſo great as to exceed the righteouſneſs of Chriſt. Neither is it becauſe the holy ſpirit is unable to change their hearts. God has all hearts in his hand, as the clay is in the hand of the Potter. But, for wiſe ends, God determines them for perdition. It is his determination which makes it impoſſible for them to be reſtored to ſalvation. Blaſpheming againſt the Holy Ghoſt, or whatever amounts to the unpardonrble ſin,* is above all others deſtructive to chriſtianity.† Accordingly, God has

* Some confine this ſin wholly to words. But if we attend to Pſal. 69, and 109; ſo to what is ſaid in other places of Ahithophel and Judas, to what Chriſt ſays of his crucifiers in his prayer, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do;' to what the apoſtle Paul ſays of his perſecuting the ſaints, yet obtained he mercy, becauſe he did it ignorantly; to what the apoſtle John ſays of the ſin unto death; attention to theſe things may, perhaps, ſhow us that conduct as well as words come into the amount, and, in ſome caſes, conſtitute a material part of the unpardonable ſin.

† Ahithophel hated David with a mortal hatred. He coolly and deliberately ſought his deſtruction becauſe of his remarkable piety and brokenneſs of heart. In oppoſition to the cleareſt light of his own conſcience, Ahithophel branded David's ſingular acts of humiliation with infamy, calling them hypocriſy. 'When I (David) wept, and chaſtened my ſoul with faſting, that was to my reproach. My kneel

has ſet a double guard againſt this ſin, by declaring, It ſhall never be forgiven.

Hence the ſentence of *perdition* is paſſed, irrevocably paſſed, and before they die, on ſuch as have had the beſt advantages for eternal life. It was as free for Judas to have received the grace of *life* in his heart, as it was for the reſt of the apoſtles. The atonement provided all outward means, motives and offers for him, as well as for them. The gift of grace, and all needed grace, was as freely offered to Ahithophel as to David. Both of theſe traitors were ſubjects of the cleareſt conviction. It was as free for them to have acted agreeably to the light of their own conſcience, as to have exerted all their malice of heart againſt this light. Such as received miraculous gifts by the Holy Ghoſt, it was equally free for each one of them to have received the Holy Ghoſt as their ſanctifier, and been partakers of thoſe *better things* which accompany ſalvation.—Theſe noted ſcripture facts illuſtrate and eſtabliſh the point before us. Full atonement for *all* is therefore conſiſtent with the endleſs perdition of *ſome* of our fallen race. From the laſt recited fact we are led,

VII. To detect the wrong uſe made by univerſaliſts of Rom. v, 18; and to apply this text to our preſent object.—'Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon *all* men to 'condemnation; even ſo by the righteouſneſs of one the *free* 'gift came upon *all* men unto juſtification of life.' It is impoſſible this *free gift* ſhould come on all men, ſo as to ſecure each individual in juſtification of eternal life. Some do fall into that ſtate from which they never can be recovered to eternal life; or they never can be renewed again to repentance, which amounts to the ſame. This text, therefore, does nothing towards proving the ſalvation of all men. To aſſert it does, is making of it contradict what we have juſt ſeen of the unpardonable ſin. And to make one part of ſcripture contradict another proves nothing.—Such as profeſs Chriſt, have been once en-

'are weak through faſting; and my fleſh faileth of fatneſs. I became alſo a reproach 'unto them; when they looked upon me they ſhaked their heads. They have re-'warded me evil for good, and hatred for my love.—He remembered not to ſhew 'mercy, but perſecuted the poor and needy man, that he might even ſlay the broken 'in heart.' Now, for the moſt diſtinguiſhed acts of devotion and humiliation, the ſpecial fruits of the holy ſpirit, for theſe to be ſtigmatized with hypocriſy, as the work of Satan, what can be more deſtructive to religion? And a profeſſed friend to David, and the firſt counſellor of the nation to do this? Not only ſo, Ahithophel's counſel for Abſalom to commit inceſt with his father's wives was the ſame as counſelling to do evil that good might come. But in Ahithophel and David we have types of Chriſt and Judas, and the greater ſin of Judas, as Chriſt was the antitype of David. Again, blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt is moſt deſtructive. To call the work of the Holy Spirit, the work of the devil, tends direct y to ſubvert the goſpel.

lightened, have rejoiced for a while, have received miraculous gifts, or have been partakers of the powers of the world to come, which is the goſpel ſtate; if ſuch openly reject Chriſt, ſo as to join in his crucifixion, or perſecute his diſciples, it is impoſſible they ſhould ever be reſtored to ſalvation or to repentance. It cannot be denied that Judas had all theſe qualifications, gifts and graces; but not having grace in his heart he *fell away*. It cannot be denied, from what we have juſt ſeen foretold of him out of the book of Pſalms, that he fell beyond the utmoſt reach of recovery. This *free gift* therefore cannot come on all men, in ſuch ſort as to ſecure the eternal ſalvation of each individual. This one exception of Judas is enough, were there nothing elſe, to ſilence univerſaliſts. This one exception of Judas muſt compel us to look out for ſome other meaning to this text in Romans, than what is taught us by univerſaliſts.

'Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all 'men to condemnation; even ſo by the righteouſneſs of one the free gift came upon all men to juſtification of life.' Granting the free gift to be expreſſive of the fullneſs of the atonement, it muſt then be conſidered as univerſal as the 'condemnation.'—There is ſome reaſon, at leaſt, to interpret the free gift, in this place, in this univerſal ſenſe: that is, that it comes on all men without exception. For the 'offence of one' is ſet in oppoſition to the 'righteouſneſs of one.' By the offence of one judgment came upon all men; even ſo by the righteouſneſs of one the free gift came upon all men. Both the former and the latter, in ſome proper ſenſe, muſt compare. This appears to be the deſign of the apoſtle. To make the compariſon in every ſenſe is going to exceſs; unleſs the circumſtances, connection, or nature of the ſubject warrant ſuch compariſon. But the contraſt between Chriſt and Adam is clearly reſtricted in one important article. It is not poſſible the free gift ſhould actually ſecure the ſalvation of every individual, for reaſons above given. Notwithſtanding, the free gift may be as extenſive as the condemnation, in ſome other intereſting article; which appears to be this: The atonement or free gift has placed all men in a ſtate of probation. It gives opportunity, means, and offers to all men, for juſtification to eternal life. Or, to ſay the leaſt, it places every one in a ſalvable ſtate. Even pagans have opportunity to 'ſeek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and 'find him.'* Thus, a price to get wiſdom, or to feel after and find

* Acts 17, 27.

ſind eternal life, is put into the hand of every one of Adam's race. In this ſenſe, the free gift is contraſted with the judgment; both being equally extenſive, or have come on all men.

Furthermore, in conſequence of Chriſt's righteouſneſs, the Holy Spirit is ſent to reprove the world of ſin, &c. It is ſuppoſed he ſtrives with all men. It is thought that every human being has his day, or ſeaſons, or times of conviction. Accordingly, the free gift appears to come upon each individual, in ſuch manner as nothing is wanting but its right improvement.—Nothing but 'a willing mind,' according to the means of light each one has, appears to be requiſite to bring him, in the iſſue, to a ſtate of juſtification of life.

It is here of eſpecial notice, the *condemnation* comes on all men juſt ſo far, and no farther than they join with Adam, and make his ſin their own. No one was ever condemned except for his own ſin. So men muſt give their free and hearty approbation to Chriſt's righteouſneſs, otherwiſe they cannot thereby obtain juſtification unto life. This is one principal thing aimed at in Rom. v. And the context of the verſe we are now explaining, is, 'They which *receive* abundance of grace and of 'the gift of righteouſneſs ſhall reign in life by one, Jeſus Chriſt.' Here the promiſe is to thoſe, and thoſe only, who *receive* abundance of grace and righteouſneſs. It is only to ſuch as cordially embrace the righteouſneſs of Chriſt. Theſe words alſo caution us againſt ſuppoſing that the *free gift on all men*, immediately following, ſhould intend any thing more than the way and means of juſtification of life; evidently limiting juſtification itſelf to ſuch as *receive*, or approve of, the gift of righteouſneſs. For, this idea the apoſtle conſtantly maintains. He begins this chapter with the doctrine of juſtification by faith alone. 'Therefore being juſtified by faith, we have peace with 'God,' &c. Which is a conſequence of what precedes. All men, whether Jews or Gentiles, who have this faith, are in a juſtified ſtate. But ſuch as have not this faith are in a ſtate of condemnation. Theſe things he had before eſtabliſhed; being ſome of the principal things he had in view. And he directly aſſerts, Ch. ix, 8, 'They which are the children of the fleſh, 'theſe are not the children of God: but the children of the promiſe are counted for the ſeed.' Inſtead of promiſes of *life* to the children of the fleſh, he gives none but threatenings of *death*. 'If ye live after the fleſh, ye ſhall die.' Ch. viii, 13. Which death is put in oppoſition to eternal life, as may be ſeen from the connection. And this threatening is frequent in this

Epiſtle.

Epiſtle. Hence, the compariſon is maintained. Such as unite with Chriſt, and *receive* the gift of his righteouſneſs, are thereby juſtified unto life eternal. But ſuch as reject Chriſt and deſpiſe his grace, ſtill approving of Adam's offence, remain under condemnation of death eternal. The condemnation comes on all men, and becauſe they join in Adam's ſin, ſo actual juſtification is a conſequence of faith in Chriſt, otherwiſe the compariſon is loſt.

There are ſcripture examples to juſtify the above interpretation of Rom. v, 18. As Eph. i, 13. The goſpel is called 'the goſpel of ſalvation.' Which is but the outward mean, to inſtruct us in the way of ſalvation. Chriſt ſaid, John iv, 22,— 'Salvation is of the Jews.' They had the oracles of God, to teach the way of ſalvation; 2 Cor. v, 19. 'God was in Chriſt, 'reconciling the world unto himſelf, not imputing their treſ-'paſſes unto them.' Here again, as we have already ſeen, we are compelled, from the connection and from facts, to conſider this as a door being open, or proviſion made for God to receive every returning ſinner, inſtead of all men being actually reconciled, and brought into covenant with him. That is, the way and means we are obliged to conſider in lieu of the event itſelf. Therefore, theſe words, 'Even ſo by the righteouſneſs of one, 'the free gift came upon all men unto juſtification of life,' muſt be taken in the ſame manner. The connection, as well as the tenour of ſcripture, obliges us to take the way and means, in this caſe, for the thing itſelf. The *free gift upon all men* intends full proviſion made for the juſtification of all men. But whether all men will be juſtified is not here decided. The words alſo, *the free gift upon all men*, might as well be rendered, *the free gift to all men.* The original admits of this conſtruction. The ſame as, ſalvation by Chriſt is provided and offered *to* all men Or, the grace of God hath appeared *to* all men.

It will now be objected, as the *judgment* upon all men to condemnation has actually taken effect upon all, ſo the *free gift* muſt, eventually, effect the juſtification and ſalvation of all;— otherwiſe the compariſon is loſt. But this has been already anſwered. The *judgment* actually takes effect upon all men to condemnation, becauſe they join with Adam. So all, who unite with Chriſt by faith, and ſuch only as unite with Chriſt by faith, are partakers of the gift of righteouſneſs. Had Paul meant to have been an univerſaliſt, why did he ſay, 'They 'which receive abundance of grace ſhall reign in life by one?' On the univerſal plan, this condition of *receiving* grace, or having

having faith in Chriſt, is totally ſet aſide. Whether men have faith or not, in this world, they are certain to reign in life.—But the apoſtle, in the ſame epiſtle, ſhows how ſome men are made veſſels of wrath fitted for deſtruction; given over to tribulation, and anguiſh, and wrath; prepared for the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who ſhall render to every man according to his deeds.*

Paul could not, with conſiſtency, on the univerſal ground, 'wiſh himſelf accurſed from Chriſt for his kinſmen according to the fleſh;'† whom he foreſaw were *caſt away* of God. If all go to heaven when they die, there are no evils except in this world. And it is hard to ſay, on this plan, who have the greateſt evils to fear, in this life, either ſaints or ſinners. Again, in Dr. Chauncy's ſcheme, the whole of the *caſting away* of God, and the ſum total of the *curſe*, is until the damned repent, or it is then finiſhed. What man of ſenſe in this caſe, would wiſh to ſuffer an evil inexpreſſibly great, ſo to deliver the damned! This indeed could not be an act of benevolence. For it is uncertain, on this plan, whether the damned will ſuffer the torments of hell to the amount of a broken bone, or even of a tooth-ach. But ſuppoſing the apoſtle to foreſee the evils coming on his kinſmen in this life, and that they would ſtand it out a long time in hell, before they ſhould yield; yet how could he wiſh to ſuffer for their relief, or even wiſh their relief, when nothing but hell-torments can fit them for heaven? Chriſt himſelf could not wiſh to die for theſe characters, neither could his death profit them.

VIII. To argue that the atonement is complete, provided all men ſhould be ſaved, and incomplete provided part ſhould be finally loſt, is making the grace of God depend on the will of creatures; and eſtimating the grace of God according to the conduct of creatures. The ſame as ſaying, if all men embrace the offers of ſalvation, made by virtue of the atonement, and are indeed ſaved, then muſt the atonement be conſidered as complete. But, if ſome men deſpiſe and reject the offers of ſalvation, and periſh everlaſtingly, then muſt the atonement be conſidered as incomplete. As though wicked men could not abuſe a good thing! As though ſinners had found out ſomething new, by clearing themſelves of blame, and charging the fault on the atonement.

The atonement is ever to be viewed as a mean which opens the door for free offers of pardon. How men treat theſe offers, makes

* Ch. 2, 5—9, and 9, 22. † Ch. 9, 3.

makes no difference as to the atonement. Proviſion is preſented in the goſpel, adequate to the needs of ruined men. But, thoſe invited to the *wedding feaſt*, as in Matt. xxii, 3, *will not come*. And the maſter of the feaſt declares, 'None of thoſe men which were bidden, ſhall taſte of my ſupper.'* Now, becauſe ſome *make light* of the offers of ſalvation, and are here expreſsly excluded the goſpel-feaſt, and forever ſhut out of heaven; does this leſſen the rich dainties of the feaſt? Does the refuſal of ſome, and their final rejection, leſſen the proviſion made? Or, does this argue there is not enough for all who have been invited, and for all men?

But, if there is nothing more than the outward means and offers of ſalvation, none will ever be ſaved. Amidſt all the rich proviſion and outward bleſſings of the goſpel, the great body of mankind deſpiſe, and wonder, and periſh. This would univerſally be the caſe, were it not that God makes ſome men willing in the day of his power. The atonement makes proviſion for God to ſhow his power and grace on the hearts of men, for whomſoever he will: either for all mankind, or a part only, as his wiſdom directs. In doing this, God acts from his ſovereign pleaſure, as in the events above related. The number of angels, and each individual, who ſtand or fall, the will of God alone determines. Whether Adam holds his paradiſe, or not, is determined wholly by the will of God. Whether the goſpel be ſpread over the whole earth, or only in parts of it, none but God can decide this. Whether all thoſe who march out of Egypt with Moſes, and croſs the Red Sea, ſhall indeed go in and poſſeſs the good land, or whether the great body of them ſhall *come ſhort* through unbelief; God alone fixes this important matter. Whether king Zedekiah and his people, cloſely beſieged by the enemy; whether all of them, or whether any part of them, will ſave their lives by falling away to the Chaldean army, lies with God only; as he lives he has no pleaſure in their death. When Jeruſalem is about to be trodden down by the Gentiles, and vengeance actually repayed on the crucifiers of Chriſt; whether many, or few, or how many of the devoted nation will ſave their lives by fleeing to mountains, this is decided by the great God and Judge of the world. Whether Judas is kept by Chriſt unto ſalvation, or whether he is *loſt*, that the ſcriptures might be fulfilled, this Chriſt himſelf determines. In all theſe inſtances, we ſee full proviſion, and a door of ſalvation opened. In all theſe inſtances we ſee perfect freedom, and blame

* Luke 14. 24.

blame resting on none but the delinquents or transgressors. In all these instances we see the sovereign determination of God. All these instances harmonize with God's own words. 'I will 'be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will shew mercy 'on whom I will shew mercy.'*

I am, &c.

LETTER III.

Whether sin deserves endless punishment; which is further to illustrate the consistency of this punishment with full atonement.

My Dear Friend,

Dr. Chauncy denies the infinite demerit of sin. And it is necessary he should, else he must at once renounce his scheme. For he holds the damned suffer all they deserve.—The arguments he uses designedly to prove that sin is not an infinite evil, and does not deserve endless punishment, will hereafter be examined.

If it cannot be made evident that sin, from its nature and tendency, is an infinite evil, a crime unboundedly great, the doctrine of endless punishment must be given up. For divine justice must appear, and be made glorious, in the sufferings of the damned. Which cannot be, unless their sufferings are proportioned to their ill desert. Therefore, we may rest assured that the damned will not be doomed to suffer an unlimited duration, unless their crime is an unlimited evil. But if it can be shown that sin against God is an evil *immeasurable*, in one or more respects *immense*; it will then be allowed that sin deserves endless punishment. And that God would be just, should he inflict this punishment.—Yea, that he must do it, whenever he lays judgment to the line, and righteousness to the plummet.

Some would account for the interminable sufferings of the damned in another way; or without proving or granting sin to be an unlimited evil. Which is to allow sin to be a very great evil, so as to render it just for God to doom sinners to a state of suffering, which is to continue as long as they shall continue to sin against him. And that God has a right to forsake sinners wholly, and never communicate to them the sanctifying agency of

* Exod. 33, 19.

of his Holy Spirit. Which is to make their unceaſing ſtate of miſery ſure. For, in this caſe, they will never ceaſe ſinning.

In reply to this ſentiment, ſcripture repreſents ſinners to be ſentenced, and forever puniſhed in the future ſtate, for ſins they committed *when in the body*, in this world. When Chriſt repreſents himſelf as ſentencing ſinners to everlaſting fire, the ſentence is grounded on their paſt conduct, in this world. :— 'For I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat,' &c. St. Paul alſo ſays, 'We muſt all appear before the judgment ſeat of 'Chriſt, that every one may receive the things done in his body, 'according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.'— Thus according to ſcripture, ſinners, at the day of judgment, will be doomed to a puniſhment they already deſerve, for their ſins committed in this life. But they would not deſerve to be doomed to miſery without end, for theſe ſins, if theſe ſins were not an infinite evil, and they infinitely criminal. It is alſo on no other ground that the glory of divine juſtice can appear, but by threatening everlaſting puniſhment, and actually executing this threatening. There does not appear to be any juſtice in condemning a criminal to a puniſhment, which he does not already deſerve, for what he has already done. This is to condemn him for that of which he is not guilty. Therefore, if the infinite demerit of ſin cannot be proved, the doctrine of endleſs puniſhment cannot be ſupported.

The following things, it is thought, will ſhow us why ſin is to be conſidered as an evil immenſely great, in what reſpect it is ſo, and why ſinners deſerve to be forever puniſhed, for their deeds done in the body.

1. The evil of ſin is not infinite in the ſame ſenſe as God is infinite. Neither is it infinite in the ſame ſenſe as the righteouſneſs of Chriſt is infinite. But it is infinite in this ſenſe, its extent cannot be meaſured by numbers. We cannot find an end to it, or count up its greatneſs. We may count, and count, by figures or by numbers, ever ſo long, and ſtill fall infinitely ſhort of finding the full extent of this evil, the evil of ſin. No other than an unlimited term will, of courſe, apply in this caſe. To call ſin therefore an infinite evil, gives a conſiſtent and true idea of the magnitude of this evil. And its magnitude or greatneſs cannot be expreſſed but by the word, infinite; unleſs it be a word of like import.

The happineſs of ſaints in heaven is called eternal happineſs. Their happineſs, however, is not eternal in the ſenſe the happineſs of God is eternal. Their exiſtence is finite and temporal.

tal. They never will arrive to any other but a finite exiſtence; and they may forever look back and ſee that their happineſs has hitherto been only temporal happineſs, or only for a time.—Whereas the exiſtence of God is in every ſenſe an eternal exiſtence. God inhabits eternity. With one eternal view he comprehends eternity. But the happineſs of ſaints in heaven is properly called an eternal happineſs, becauſe it will never come to an end. So ſin is properly called an infinite evil, on account of the evil it tends to do, and becauſe it deſerves endleſs miſery. This will preſently appear. Therefore,

2. Sin conſiſts in wrong affection, an evil propenſity, or what ſcripture calls 'an evil heart.' This evil heart is wholly oppoſed to the law of God. Although the written law may not be brought into view, yet this evil heart ſtands ready to oppoſe it whenever it is brought into view. And ſtands ready to oppoſe the Divine Being, whenever his character is exhibited to the underſtanding. This evil propenſity, or carnal mind, is enmity againſt God; is not ſubject to his law, neither indeed can be. Again, this evil propenſity, this *ſin*, 'is the tranſgreſſion of the law;'* or violation of the law, as it might be rendered. Now, the law being holy, juſt, and good, it is of the firſt importance it ſhould be maintained. The ſafety and happineſs of all holy creatures depend upon its inviolable preſervation. Therefore, to violate this law, which goes to weaken and deſtroy it, muſt be an incalculable evil. The greateſt miſchief would hereby enſue, did not the almighty interpoſe.

3. Sin is increaſed and becomes more aggravated by the increaſe of light; or by increaſing knowledge, ſinners have, of moral objects. It is alſo thought that moral evil cannot exiſt without ſome degree of knowledge of moral objects. This appears to be the only ground, on which the line of diſtinction can be drawn between rational accountable beings and the brutal kind. And, 'Where no law is, there is no tranſgreſſion.' Rom. iv. 15. Which implies that accountability does ſuppoſe a law; conſequently knowledge of this law, or rule of right and wrong in a moral ſenſe. Again, Rom. ii. 12, 14, 15; 'As 'many as have ſinned without law, ſhall alſo periſh without law; 'and as many as have ſinned in the law, ſhall be judged by the 'law. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by 'nature the things contained in the law, theſe having not the 'law, are a law unto themſelves: Which ſhow the work of the 'law written in their hearts; their conſcience alſo bearing wit-

'neſs,

* 1 John 3. 4.

'neſs, and their thoughts the mean while accuſing or elſe ex-
'cuſing one another.'* Conviction of moral good and evil, their conſcience bearing witneſs, and their thoughts accuſing or excuſing one another, is the law written in their hearts, or imprinted upon their minds by the divine Spirit. Which law, and no other, as appears from the connection, is to juſtify or condemn them; 'In the day when God ſhall judge the ſecrets of 'men by Jeſus Chriſt.' As this law written in their hearts, which is the only law to judge them by, is here called conviction of ſin; their conſcience, their thoughts accuſing or excuſing, ſo when it is ſaid, 'Where no law is, there is no tranſ-'greſſion,' it plainly argues that where no conviction of ſin is, nor ever has been, there is no ſin.† Conſcience, therefore, bears witneſs againſt evil deeds, and againſt the evil propenſity of the heart; ſo far, at leaſt, as to leave every human being without excuſe. And ſin becomes more ſinful by increaſing light. 'Unto whomſoever much is given, of him ſhall be much 'required.' This ſhows the infinite odiouſneſs of ſin, it being oppoſed to an accuſing conſcience; alſo the juſtice of God in puniſhing tranſgreſſors.

4. Sin is evidently an unlimited evil, and deſerving endleſs puniſhment, becauſe it is againſt God. That all ſin is againſt God, is apparent, from what we have juſt ſeen. A violation of his law is a direct diſhonor done to him. It is deſpiſing his honor, and treading his authority in the duſt. 'Some inſtances 'of ſin are more directly againſt God, than others; but all ſin 'is

* There appears no more difficulty in ſuppoſing even infants to have ſome ſenſe of right and wrong, as to moral things, than in ſuppoſing them to be rational, accountable beings. Conſcience, which bears witneſs, is the dictate of the Holy Spirit.—And it ſeems conſiſtent to conclude God can and does give this to infants, or certainly to all who are accountable to him. This ſeems to be proved from Romans, as above.

† A writer in the N. Y. Miſſionary Magazine, vol. ii, p. 117, arguing that the knowledge of moral objects is not neceſſary to the exiſtence of moral evil or ſin, ſays, 'On this hypotheſis, (that is, allowing conviction of ſin neceſſary to its exiſtence) a '*ſinner*, and a perſon under *conviction*, are phraſes perfectly ſynonymous; one neceſſarily implying the other—Conſequently, to endeavor to produce and promote *con-*'*viction* in men, muſt really be to endeavor to promote their being ſinners, ſince *ſin* 'cannot exiſt without conviction.' But this argument totally vaniſhes, only by granting there are *degrees* of *conviction*. For, in this caſe, the loweſt degree of *remorſe* leaves the ſinner without excuſe. But the higheſt degree, or a very great degree of conviction, according to the uſual operations of divine grace, ſeems neceſſary to converſion. The Jews appear to have had ſome ſenſe of guilt, through the whole proceſs, when they crucified Chriſt; and when 'they *ſmote on their breaſts*, and returned.' But their conviction was vaſtly greater, on their hearing Peter preach at the day of Pentecoſt. Hence, we can 'endeavor to promote conviction in men, without endeavoring 'to promote their being ſinners.' Beſides, means of conviction tend to lead ſinners to repentance, and whether they repent, or not.

is againſt him, and he is the chief object who is oppoſed and injured by it; becauſe he is the firſt and the greateſt; and ſo much exceeds all others, who can be injured by ſin, in his being, worth, and extenſive rights and intereſt, that, in compariſon with him, they are of no conſideration, ſink into nothing, and vaniſh. This is ſtrongly expreſſed by David, when he was humbling himſelf before God for his ſins. 'Againſt thee, *thee only*, have I ſinned, and done this evil in *thy ſight*.'*

But God, againſt whom ſin is committed, is a Being of infinite value. His power and wiſdom, united with his goodneſs, his holineſs and happineſs, are of boundleſs worth. He has alſo made, and he upholds all things for his own pleaſure. On him all others depend; and from him every good, enjoyed by creatures, is derived. He only, has a right to rule and reign, and ſit upon the throne of his glory forever. And his kingdom that ruleth over all, and his dominion that has no end, is abſolutely perfect. 'The LORD is righteous in all his ways, and holy in all his works.' Hence, an injury done to this Being, or ſin againſt God, is an unlimited evil. To deny this, would be a denial of ſome of the moſt plain dictates of common ſenſe.

When an offence and injury is committed among men, we always eſtimate its criminality, as being greater or leſs, according to the character and worth of the perſon injured. Thus, when a father, who is moſt prudent, kind, and affectionate towards his ſon, as well as towards the whole family, and towards all men; is treated by his ſon with cruelty and contempt: we always judge this rebellious ſon to be far more criminal, than if he had treated one of the ſervants of the family in the ſame manner. The worthineſs of the father, as well as the relation he ſuſtains, renders the crime of the ſon vaſtly more heinous, in the former inſtance, than it would be in the latter. So, when a chief ruler, who is remarkable for his firmneſs, wiſdom, and benevolence; and on whoſe righteous adminiſtration the ſafety of the nation depends; when this chief ruler's character is vilified and outraged, his perſon abuſed, and he finally aſſaſſinated; and all this on account of his unſhaken reſolution to promote the higheſt good of the nation; the crime is vaſtly greater, in this caſe, than it would be to treat one of the loweſt ſubjects in the ſame manner.

In

* Dr. Hopkins on the *Future State*, Sect. 4. Where proof of the infinite evil of ſin is largely and accurately given. And the reader will find the ſame in Preſident Edwards's ſermon on the *Eternity of hell-torments*, and his tract on *Juſtification*; alſo, in Dr. Bellamy's *Eſſay on the Goſpel*, Sect. 5.

In theſe inſtances, it is one of the firſt dictates of common ſenſe, that the character of the injured ſhould be brought into the account, to aſcertain the nature of the crime. Indeed, if we leave out the character of him that is injured, or of him to whom the deed is done, we bring all crimes upon a level, or rather we reject all ground of diſtinction between moral good and evil. Suppoſing a man is found dead in his field, and it is known his neighbour intentionally killed him; there is no way to decide whether this be a juſtifiable act or a capital crime, in the former, without recourſe to the character and conduct of the latter. Granting the latter to have been a noted robber, and that his neighbour killed him in his own defence; then has he done a brave and virtuous act; as well by ridding the world of a vile monſter, as by ſaving his own life. But granting this man to have been killed without provocation, that his neighbour did it *wittingly*, and for his own gratification; then has he committed murder. Again, another is put to death, and the perpetrator of the deed is guilty of moſt horrid murder; his crime being aggravated to the higheſt degree, as in the aſſaſſination of the chief ruler, juſt mentioned. Now, the evidence in theſe caſes is irreſiſtible; and why one crime is more heinous than another there needs no length of argument for proof; it being, in a ſenſe, *ſelfevident*. There are, in general, various circumſtances and connections attending, which render ſin *more or leſs* ſinful. But, in eſtimating deeds done to perſons, if we leave out both their civil and religious characters; every thing is then brought upon a level. And we may fight, rob, and devour our fellowmen; or we may ſlaughter the brutal kind, it is all one:*

Hence, in aſcertaining the evil of ſin, and the injury thereby done to God, his character muſt come into the account. Otherwiſe we rob him of that right which is indiſpenſable among men. And common ſenſe revolts at the idea of going on this ground, in our treatment of one another. Common ſenſe revolts

At

* It is allowed as a general rule, when a robbery is committed, we do not ſtand to enquire into the character of the man robbed. It is taken for granted he had not forfeited his right to hold property. Therefore, the character of the injured is here taken for granted. Again, it is allowed to be as criminal to rob a vicious as a virtuous man, as the caſe might be ſtated. But the fact is, neither the virtuous nor the vicious man has forfeited his right to property. By virtue of civil compact, one has the ſame right to his goods and chattels as the other. Hence, character makes the deciſion, in both caſes. But our enemies at open war with us, as the caſe might be, have forfeited their right to property; i. e, it is lawful for us to take their goods and chattels wherever found. In one caſe, therefore, it is right, in another it is wrong, to lay hands on property wherever we can. And nothing but character decides the *right* and *wrong*. And in every imaginable caſe, the character of him to whom the deed is done muſt be taken in, to eſtimate the moral quality of the deed. Otherwiſe men are levelled with brutes.

at the idea of ſtripping men of their characters, whether civil or religious; ſo ſtripping them wholly of their rights, both natural and moral; and leaving them upon a par with the beaſts of the field. The character of God, therefore, muſt be conſidered as the rule or ground, in deciding the evil of ſin. If it is not, he is robbed of his character. If it is not, how is he treated according to his character? And how is ſin an injury to his character? Certainly, to find out the nature of an injury, we muſt have recourſe to the object injured. Not only ſo, to diſregard the value of the object injured, is treating of it as though it were of no value. Again, if the divine character be not the rule or ground to decide in this caſe, what rule have we? Why is ſin againſt God an evil, unleſs it be againſt a Being of worth, and excellence? Scripture alſo, throughout, ſtates things in the ſame light. It is becauſe the LORD is God, that ſin againſt him is ſinful. It is becauſe of his worth, excellence, and importance; in other words, the dignity of his character. Therefore, as all ſin is againſt God, and as he is a Being of *infinite* worth, excellence, and importance; ſo ſin againſt him is an evil *immenſely* great; conſequently deſerving endleſs puniſhment.

To deny this is ſtriking directly at the dignity of the divine character. It is robbing God of all his glory. For we muſt give him his full character, or we ſtrip him of each divine attribute. His honour is infinitely ſacred and valuable. That which diſhonours him is, of courſe, an infinite evil. Therefore, as ſin is diſhonourary to him, ſo it is an infinite evil, or one immeaſurably great. But, to deny this, is ſaying that an injury to his character is not an infinite evil: therefore his honour is not of infinite value: therefore he is no longer God! To treat a daring inſult to a chief ruler as an ordinary offence, or as though it were done to the loweſt of ſubjects, goes to trample on his high authority; as well as to declare he has either loſt his character, or never had one. Is it, therefore, degrading to a chief ruler, and on account of his high ſtation and character, to ſay that an inſult to him is not an high-handed offence? How much more, to argue that a diſhonour done to the Moſt High is not an incalculable evil? Eliphaz ſaid to Job, 'Is not thy wickedneſs 'great? and thine iniquities *infinite?*'*—poſitively aſſerting that they were. Which muſt be taken literally, as a juſt definition of all ſin, as all ſin is againſt God. Hence, the infinite demerit of ſin is plain, or it evidently deſerves an interminable puniſhment.

5. The unlimited evil of ſin, and its deſert of endleſs puniſhment,

* Job 22. 5.

ment, is apparent from its evil tendency. Sin leads to evil. Sin tends to nothing but evil. This is the nature of all ſin, tending only to do miſchief.

It tends to do the greateſt miſchief among rational beings. Indeed, ſin would actually effect infinite or everlaſting miſchief in the community, were it not prevented by ſuperior force. For certainly, lying, theft, adultery, murder and every violation of God's law, directly goes to deſtroy the happineſs of ſociety. As diſeaſes go to deſtroy the health of human bodies, ſo does ſin the happineſs of bodies politic. Not only ſo, ſin robs the individual who commits it, or the ſinner, of all true happineſs. It leads him off from God, the only ſource of real good. It renders his breaſt, his whole ſoul, the ſeat of vexation, *and woe*. 'The wicked are like the troubled ſea.'*

And as ſin is oppoſed to holineſs, ſo it is oppoſed to the holy happineſs of the righteous. It would root out and deſtroy all their happineſs, could it have its natural courſe. Did not God interpoſe, it would make the righteous everlaſtingly miſerable. This is exemplified by the conduct of Cain, in ſlaying his brother Abel. 'And wherefore ſlew he him? Becauſe his own 'works were evil, and his brother's righteous.'† It is here remarkable, Cain's hatred, in this inſtance, was unbounded. He ſought to annihilate his brother's holineſs and happineſs. It cannot be ſuppoſed that he deſired to make him miſerable for a time only, and that he might afterwards become holy and happy. It was becauſe his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous, that he ſlew him. Which was a clear exhibition of hatred to all righteouſneſs, as well as an exertion to put a final end to his brother's righteouſneſs. This mortal hatred alſo has all the appearance of ſeeking the greateſt poſſible evil, to innocent Abel. And this was the ſame as for Cain to will and endeavour his eternal miſery. This unbounded hatred, as it appears, would, if poſſible, treat every righteous perſon in the ſame manner. But the caſe before us is placed beyond diſpute, by the conduct of ſatan when he *beguiled* Eve.‡ The *old ſerpent* then evidently exerted himſelf, to entail on our whole race, eternal evil. And the reaſon why his envy and malice was ſo kindled againſt Adam and Eve, was their innocency; their holineſs, and their conſequent happineſs. This is evident from the character ſcripture every where gives of ſatan. As all ſin is of one kind, ſo it is all joining with ſatan in every thing he does; eſpecially in that noted act of ſeducing our firſt parents. Hence, all ſin tends to effect the greateſt miſchief in the community. And would certainly bring endleſs miſery upon all the righteous, were it not prevented.

In

* Iſai. 57. 20. † 1 John 3. 12. ‡ Gen. 3. 13.

In like manner, ſin or ſinners would, if they could, deſtroy the happineſs of God himſelf, and make him eternally miſerable. 'The fool hath ſaid in his heart, No God.'* This can mean nothing elſe than that the fool, or ſinner, wiſhes the infinite God either to be ſtruck out of being, or made forever miſerable. That ſinners carry their reſentment ſo high, as to wiſh the latter, appears from the motive which ſtirred up the Jews to crucify Chriſt. And the main thing that ſtimulated the Jews to this horrid deed, was, becauſe he *made himſelf God;* and proved himſelf to be God, equal with the Father.† Again, after the Jews had ſtriking conviction Chriſt was riſen from the dead, they ſtill exerted themſelves to have the world think he was *a deceiver;* that 'his diſciples came by night and ſtole him away.' Which was to fix an everlaſting ſtain upon his character; ſo to make him everlaſtingly wretched and miſerable. This notorious fact, the Jews' treatment of Chriſt, proves how wicked men hate God, and how they would treat him, could they have him in their power. For the Jews' hatred to Chriſt was kindled into rage, when he declared and proved himſelf to be God. Chriſt ſaid of them, 'They have both ſeen, and hated both me and my Father.'‡ It was GOD they hated; it was the LORD JEHOVAH whom they wiſhed to plunge into endleſs miſery and diſgrace. Chriſt put himſelf into a capacity of ſuffering pain, ſhame, and death; that the world might know what ſin is, how ſinners hate God and how they would treat him, were they able. All ſin is of the ſame nature, tending to the ſame miſchievous end, and joining with the betrayer and crucifiers of Chriſt.

Hence, the unlimited evil of ſin, from its tendency to do evil, and nothing but evil, is ſtrikingly evident. Certainly, that which tends to the entire deſtruction of happineſs, in ſociety; that which tends to root out all holineſs; and to make angels and ſaints, even God himſelf, miſerable without end; if this be not an unlimited evil, it is impoſſible to ſay what is. A puniſhment, therefore, inflicted on ſinners, ſhort of endleſs, would be infinitely leſs than they deſerve.

Furthermore, no propoſition can be plainer than this, ſin is oppoſition to holineſs. And this oppoſition is an active oppoſition, with its whole ſtrength acting againſt holineſs, and tending to deſtroy it. How can ſin be ſin unleſs it is hurtful and deſtructive to holineſs? Where is the moral evil of ſin, unleſs it is deſtructive to moral good? And how is ſin deſtructive to holineſs,

* This is the original reading of Pſal. 14. 1, and 53. 1.

† Matt. 26. 63—66. Luke 22. 67—71. John 5. 18, and 8. 58, 59, and 10. 31—33.

‡ John 15. 20.

holineſs, unleſs the ſtrength of the former is exerted againſt the latter? And how is ſin altogether ſinful, unleſs its whole ſtrength is ſet againſt holineſs? Hatred to God carries in it a diſtinct idea of active oppoſition to God. Enmity againſt God is ſtrength exerted againſt God. Where there is no ſtrength exerted againſt God, there can be no enmity againſt him. This hatred or enmity againſt God is wholly pointed againſt his holineſs, or becauſe he is an holy God. To ſuppoſe otherwiſe would be denying ſin to be ſin. The ſinner dreads the power of God, but this is becauſe he expects God will employ his power in an holy manner. Could he expect God would employ his power in a ſinful manner, agreeably to his own ſinful wiſhes, he would then have no dread of his almighty power, nor hatred towards it. Of courſe it is ultimately the holineſs of God which is hated by the ſinner, and which the ſinner wiſhes to deſtroy.

The ſinner ſeeks his own good, as the firſt and higheſt good, in his own view. Beloved ſelf is his idol. His whole heart and ſoul is bound up in ſelf-gratification. He is ſenſible he cannot attain his end, while the law of God, the providence of God, or God himſelf ſtands in his way. He would have divine providence, the divine law, and even the great Lawgiver yield to his own individual intereſt. He would have all bow to him. He longs to live in this world forever, and make this world his own. So he would entirely fruſtrate the holy decrees and counſels of Heaven, and therefore make the holy God eternally wretched.—We ſhall now attend to the following *objections:*

1. It is urged that no ſuch evil, as was juſt mentioned, ever can come on ſaints and angels, or on the divine Being. God is infinitely above the reach of rebel men; and none of his enemies can interrupt his eternal happineſs, or hurt him in the leaſt degree; neither is it poſſible the righteous ſhould fail of eternal life. Not only ſo, God will eventually over-rule all the ſin in the world for his own glory, and for the greateſt good of his choſen people. Why then ſhould ſinners deſerve to be puniſhed, as if they had actually effected infinite evil, when the evil tendency of what they do, and their criminal endeavors are wholly fruſtrated, and no ſuch evil is ever brought about? Dr. Huntington urges this as an argument againſt future puniſhment, page 217, 220.

Anſwer—This objection contradicts common ſenſe. 'The 'crime is not to be eſtimated by the evil that is actually effected 'by it; but by the nature and tendency of what is done, and 'the

'the aim of the criminal. Though the evil conſequence be 'prevented, and it be not in the power of the criminal to effect 'it; yet, if he does what he can to accompliſh it, his crime is 'to be eſtimated, by his manifeſt diſpoſition, and the tendency 'of what he does. If a ſubject attempts to take away the life of 'a king; or from diſaffection to him, does that which tends to 'deſtroy him, and would do it, were he not prevented; though 'the life of the king be not hurt, and the attempt wholly miſcar-'ries; yet he is juſtly condemned as guilty of high treaſon, and 'puniſhed accordingly.'*—'The ſinner does all he can to de-'throne his Maker, and render him infinitely miſerable, and ruin 'his kingdom forever: Every ſin has a ſtrong and mighty ten-'dency to this; and no thanks to the ſinner, that this infinite e-'vil has not been effected, by his rebellion: And is his crime 'not ſo great, becauſe the evil is prevented, by the infinite pow-'er and wiſdom of God? He who will aſſert this, muſt renounce 'all reaſon and common ſenſe.'*

Again, Scripture decides this point. Pſal. xxviii. 4. 'Give 'them *according to their deeds*, and *according to the wick-'edneſs of their endeavours:* Give them after the work of 'their hands, and render to them *their deſert*.' Therefore, the *deſert* of the wicked is according to the *wickedneſs* of their *en-deavours*. They are alſo to be puniſhed according to the *wick-edneſs* of their *endeavours;* whether *theſe* are accompliſhed or not. And Pſal. xxi. 8, &c. 'Thine hand ſhall find out all thine 'enemies; thy right hand ſhall find out thoſe that hate thee. Thou 'ſhalt make them as a fiery oven in the time of thine anger, &c. 'For they *intended evil againſt thee;* they imagined a miſ-'chievous device, *which they are not able to perform*.'—'Ac-'cording to the objection, *their intending evil againſt God*, 'and *imagining a miſchievous device, which they were not 'able to perform*, ought to have been given as a reaſon why 'they *ſhould not* be puniſhed; whereas it is here mentioned as 'a reaſon why God would certainly puniſh them.'†

Sinners evidently do all they can againſt God, to dethrone him, and make him eternally miſerable. They eagerly purſue worldly objects, or every ſinful pleaſure, while they caſt God behind their back. They are determined on their own ſelfiſh ends, let what will become of the divine honour. They riſe in rebellion againſt their Maker: They ſay in heart, No God: They blaſpheme his holy name: They ſet their mouth againſt the heavens! God would have been dethroned, and made miſ-erable forever, had ſinners been able to bring it about. This is

* Dr. Hopkins, *on the future ſtate*, p. 127. † Ibid. p. 127, 128.

fully proved by what the Jews did, in crucyfying Chriſt. Eſpecially, when they invented a lye, after his reſurrection, to have the world believe him to be *a deceiver*. And whatever injury, ſlight, or neglect ſinners do to the cauſe or intereſt of Chriſt, or to his diſciples, it is the ſame as if it were done to him. 'In as 'much as ye did it not to one of the leaſt of theſe, ye did it not 'to me.'* Thus, every ſin they commit is directly againſt Chriſt, againſt God, and has an immediate tendency to cover him with diſgrace, and make him infinitely and eternally wretched. Do they not, therefore, deſerve to be treated after the ſame manner, by him, and made miſerable forever? 'Would any puniſhment 'ſhort of this be in any meaſure anſwerable to the crime? If 'they have caſt God behind their back, and cared nothing for his 'honor, intereſt or happineſs; do they not deſerve to be caſt off 'by God, and that he ſhould take no care of their intereſt or happineſs? Their hearts have been full of miſchievous devices a'gainſt God, and all they have done has tended to deſtroy him, 'his happineſs and kingdom: And will it not be juſt to bring 'the miſchief on their own heads, and give them over to endleſs 'miſery? Among the laws given by Moſes to Iſrael, is the fol'lowing one: Deut. xix. 16, &c. 'If a falſe witneſs riſe up 'againſt any man to teſtify againſt him that which is wrong; 'the judge ſhall make diligent inquiſition: And behold, if the 'witneſs be a falſe witneſs, and teſtified falſely againſt his broth'er: *then ſhall ye do unto him, as he had thought to have 'done unto his brother.* And thine eye ſhall not pity, but life 'ſhall go for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, 'foot for foot. This law requires them to puniſh the man, 'who, by falſe witneſs, thought and endeavoured to bring evil 'on his brother, by inflicting that very evil on him, though his 'brother received not the leaſt hurt by it. All will doubtleſs 'ſay, this is a righteous law; and it is but juſt that ſuch an evil 'deſigning man ſhould be thus puniſhed. And will it be un'righteous in God, who ordered this law, to act by the ſame rule, 'in puniſhing thoſe who have borne falſe witneſs againſt him and 'his character?'†—But the Jews bore falſe witneſs againſt Chriſt, to put him to death; and, after his reſurrection, to make him appear an Impoſtor: thereby exerting their malice, to rob him of all his glory and happineſs. By their *wicked endeavors*, they did, however, but fulfil what the hand and counſel of God determined before to be done: And this is ſtated as the ground of their ill deſert, as in Acts ii. 23, and iv. 25—28. That is, becauſe, they had done, 'with wicked hands,' what the

* Matt. 25. 45. † Inquiry into the future ſtate, p. 128, 129.

the council of God had determined to be done. For they intend no ſuch thing as the fulfilment of the divine counſel. How could they, when they did it with wicked hands? It is here remarkable, the intention of the crucifiers of Chriſt and the divine counſel, were, ultimately, in direct oppoſition to each other. The divine counſel was that Chriſt ſhould be crucified, in the ſame manner as he was; and thereby raiſed and exalted to eternal glory. But his crucifiers intended he ſhould thereby ſink into endleſs contempt. Accordingly, their ultimate aim, their doing what they did, deſignedly to fruſtrate the divine counſel, although at the ſame time they fulfilled it, decided their ill deſert. Therefore, as the Jews *thought to have done unto* Chriſt, the ſame evil they incurred on their own guilty heads. *Life ſhall go for life, eye for eye,* &c.

Objection 2. If ſin be an unlimited evil, and deſerve endleſs puniſhment, becauſe it is committed againſt an infinite God; then the virtue of creatures is an unlimited good, and merits endleſs happineſs, becauſe it is exerciſed towards the ſame infinite Being; which is a contradiction both to Scripture and common ſenſe.

Anſwer. Both Scripture and common ſenſe ſolve this objection. Firſt, how it is ſolved by the latter.—He who is ever ſo punctual in paying his juſt debts, merits the protection of government while he continues in this line of honeſty, and no longer. When he wilfully refuſes to fulfil his *bona fide* contracts, he is then to be treated as a knave. And his paſt good deeds cannot be ſet off as a ballance for his preſent knavery. The moſt virtuous ſubject in the community, has hitherto merited nothing, towards atoning for high treaſon; ſhould he hereafter be guilty of this crime. The virtue of an age has merited nothing, to be ſet off againſt the crime of a day. *An abandoned* character, though once famed for virtue, is now as odious as if this perſon had always been *abandoned*. Should a man do more good than one half of the nation beſides, ſhould he do all the good deeds that can be named, and then turn traitor to his country; this latter deed would obliterate all the former: Or the former would do nothing towards atoning for the latter. And men are impriſoned for life, for the crime of a day; or for a crime committed ſeemingly in a moment. Theſe facts, among men, ſhow us, that we do not conſider the merit of virtue, in any meaſure ſo extenſive as the demerit of vice. And the reaſon is plain. The ſafety and beſt intereſt of each individual of the community, depend on his own zeal to encourage virtue,

and

and promote the beſt intereſt of the whole. Accordingly, each individual is indebted to the public for his own ſafety, and the public is indebted to each individual; in ſuch manner as one is a ballance to the other. In ſuch manner as the virtuous man receives his reward as he paſſes along. Even David, who was worth ten thouſand of his brethren, was more than paid, for every good deed he did. As he was thereby greatly honored, and held in high eſteem, by the whole nation. And as theſe diſtinctions, under Providence could have been ſecured to him, only by his excelling in virtue. David's reward, hereafter, muſt therefore be of grace, and not of debt.

Hence, as common ſenſe teaches, that virtue is more than rewarded, in this life; and that virtue can, in no meaſure, atone for vice; ſo it teaches that the latter is unlimited, as to its deſert, and the former limited. Were creature-virtue and vice both unlimited, the former might be ſet off againſt the latter. Were they both limited, then the former might, in ſome meaſure at leaſt, make amends for the latter. But as facts prove the contrary, we muſt conclude the demerit of vice to be unlimited, while the merit of virtue in creatures is limited.

It is neceſſary to notice the vaſt difference there is, in this life, between one virtuous man's reward, as to outward bleſſings, and that of another. Here, we are obliged to have recourſe to Scripture. Which aſſures us, however ſome good men may be abuſed and perſecuted, yet, by the conſolations of a good conſcience and the enjoyment of God's preſence, they notwithſtanding 'receive an hundred fold in this time.' See Mark x. 30, and Matt. xix. 29. Real virtue or holineſs is therefore, in every poſſible caſe in this life, rewarded an hundred fold. Again,

Secondly, Scripture ſhows us clearly the reaſon why the virtue of creatures has no merit; or the reaſon why creatures, in ſtrict juſtice, can bring in no debt againſt their Creator. They derive their all from him. They depend on him for their whole exiſtence. They depend on him for the continuation of their being, as much as for their firſt exiſtence. Every motion, power, and thought in creatures, is conſtantly produced by God; as was their firſt motion and thought. 'Not that we are ſufficient of ourſelves *to think* any thing as of ourſelves; but our 'ſufficiency is of God.'* 'In him we live, and move, and 'have our being.'† Or in him we live and are *moved*. Creatures of courſe can return nothing to God but what they firſt receive from him. The holineſs of *angels* is firſt produced by the

* Cor. 3. 5. † Acts 17. 28.

the agency of the Holy Ghoſt. All their love to God is the immediate production of his Spirit. This is evident from the account given in the Bible of the office and work of the holy Spirit; as well as from the nature of creature-dependence. Therefore, although angels do whatever is required of them, and after they have done all, they can addreſs their Maker in theſe words of Solomon, when he dedicated the temple: All things come of thee, and of 'thine own have we given unto thee.'* And every thing whereby holy angels are enabled to do the will of God perfectly, they undoubtedly eſteem as a gift from him. The means put into their hands, their knowledge, their ſtrength, their alacrity, their zeal, their animation, their love; all theſe, as they cannot but know, are the gift of God. It is God that gives to angels, and not angels that give to God. Or they have firſt received of him, therefore give him only what they have firſt received.

Conſequently, angels, with the univerſe of rational creatures, owe their all to God. To him they are indebted for their whole exiſtance. And when they love him with their whole mind and ſtrength, and ſpend themſelves in his ſervice, they do no more than pay to him his equal demands. How is it poſſible they ſhould do more, when they can return nothing to him but what he has firſt given to them? Furthermore, God is worthy of all this ſervice. The dignity and amiableneſs of his character, as well the place he fillls, render it reaſonable and juſt that rational creatures ſhould be entirely devoted to him. The law is indeed holy and *juſt*, becauſe it requires no more nor leſs of creatures, towards their Creator, than accords with divine perfection. On this is founded the equity of his law. That is, becauſe God is what he is, intelligent creatures juſtly owe him that love expreſſed in the law. Alſo becauſe they derive their all from him. Certainly if God has a right to command, this right is founded in *right*, in juſtice. Hence we ſee, a deviation from the law is ſin, an unlimited evil as has been ſhown. But virtue, perfect holineſs in creatures, relative to their duty to God, is paying him their juſt debts.

We can ſee it to be deſirable, and wiſe in God, for him to continue holy beings, who have never ſinned, in holineſs and happineſs. In this view of things it is juſt; and becauſe God hereby does no injuſtice. But we cannot ſee that theſe holy beings have a juſt claim, for him to continue them in happineſs; unleſs it be a claim by virtue of covenant or promiſe. God enters into covenant with angels; promiſing them an endleſs paradiſe,

* 1. Chron. 29. 14.

paradiſe, on condition of their perfect obedience, during their ſtate of trial. But their being, their capacity of entering into this covenant, their power to keep it perfectly, yea the covenant itſelf, propounded to them; all theſe are the gift of God. And it is his gift which inclines them to enter on their ſtate of endleſs joy; after they have perſevered through their time of trial. It is his gift, as the ſole cauſe, which makes them holy & happy without end. Not only ſo, all theſe rich gifts to angels, are marks of divine condeſcenſion. To propound a covenant to angels, the creatures of his power, and enable them to keep it perfectly, is a token of his wondrous and glorious condeſcenſion.—'Who *humbleth* himſelf to behold the things that are in 'heaven.'*

It is granted, angels can claim the divine promiſe, after they have fulfilled on their part. Yet they can and do thank God, for that gift which cauſes them to hold this claim. They can thank him for making them juſt what they are. They muſt thank him for every thing whereby they riſe above the brutal kind, or mere non-exiſtence. Therefore, although angels can claim an eternal reſidence in heaven, for what they have done for God, and are ſaid to be juſtified by works, yet theſe very works are literally the gift of God. Theſe works originate, as the firſt cauſe, from the love and faithfulneſs of God to angels, and not from the love and faithfulneſs of angels to God. So angels have cauſe of gratitude that they are made to do works for this infinite, ever bleſſed, and adorable Being. In the actual performance of theſe works, their heaven is complete. Hence, it is unqueſtionable, as angels increaſe in holineſs and happineſs, to eternity, their indebtedneſs to divine bounty and love increaſes, in the ſame ratio.

It is allowed that virtue in creatures, in ſome reſpects, is equally extenſive with vice. One is directly oppoſite to the other. And as ſinners hate God with all their ſtrength, ſo ſaints, thoſe in heaven, love God with all their ſtrength. As ſinners deſire the infinite and eternal miſery of God, ſo ſaints as ſtrongly deſire his infinite and eternal happineſs. Again, virtue in creatures appears to have as great a tendency to do good, as vice has to do evil. Virtue in individuals, or in public bodies, appears to be as powerful a mean to promote virtue, as vice is, in the ſame caſes, to promote vice. Aud the holineſs and happineſs of heaven, as we have reaſon to conclude, is eventually effected by means, as much as the ſin and miſery of hell. Virtue therefore ſeems to have as great an influence in doing good,

as

* Pſal. 113. 6.

as vice has in doing evil. Indeed the virtue of creatures, as we may rationally argue, actually does infinite and eternal good; or the holineſs and happineſs of creatures in which all his works centre, conſtitute the eternal happineſs of Deity himſelf. In other words, God forever rejoices in his own works; 'For his 'pleaſure they are and were created.'* His infinite and eternal happineſs, and his pleaſure in his own works, are both one. Not in ſuch manner as God is dependent, in the leaſt degree, on creatures. As he is the firſt cauſe and laſt end, ſo all depends on him. But, although holineſs in creatures may tend to do as much good, as ſin does evil; yet there is a wide difference, as to the extent of demerit in one, and merit in the other. The former is only paying the juſt debt, creatures owe to God; while the latter would take all from him, and make him infinitely wretched.

Objection 3. Sin can neither be an unlimited evil nor deſerve endleſs puniſhment: Becauſe endleſs puniſhment implies ſuch a different treatment of the ſmalleſt ſinners and ſmalleſt ſaints, as is out of all proportion to their reſpective characters; it is therefore incredible, and not reconcilable with the juſtice and impartiality of God.—This is one of Dr. Chauncy's principal arguments, he urges on his ſide of the queſtion.† Dr. Edwards gives it the following anſwer.

'1. That there is an infinite difference between the treatment 'of two perſons, one of whom is ſent to endleſs miſery, the 'other not, is readily granted. But that the one, who is ſent 'to ſuch puniſhment, is treated unjuſtly, is not granted; and 'to aſſert, that he is treated unjuſtly, is to *beg* and not to prove 'the thing in queſtion.

'2. That of the two perſons now ſuppoſed, one ſhould be 'treated according to his demerits, and the other by the 'bound-'leſs goodneſs of God,' ſhould be exempted from that puniſh-'ment, to which, by his demerit, he is juſtly liable, is nothing 'incredible or unjuſt. Surely the gracious exemption of one 'man from that puniſhment, which he deſerves, renders not the 'puniſhment of another unjuſt, which would otherwiſe be juſt.

'3. As there is no injuſtice in the caſe now ſtated, ſo neither 'is there any partiality in it. There is no partiality in the con-'duct of the Supreme Magiſtrate, who condemns one criminal 'according to his demerit, and pardons another criminal equal-'ly guilty. But partiality is then practiſed, when of two real 'and known criminals, one is condemned by the judge; the 'other cleared, on the pretence, that he is innocent. So that 'this

* Rev. 4. 11. † *Salva. all Men*, p. 320, 364.

'this whole argument from the incredibly different treatment of 'the ſmalleſt ſinner and ſmalleſt ſaint, whoſe characters are ſo 'nearly on a level, ſo far as it ſuppoſes the different treatment 'to be incredible, on account of the endleſs puniſhment of the 'ſinner, is a mere begging of the queſtion. It takes for grant-'ed, that the ſinner does not deſerve an endleſs puniſhment.— 'So far as it ſuppoſes the different treatment to be incredible, on 'account of the infinite reward or happineſs beſtowed on the 'ſaint, it ſuppoſes, that God in his infinite goodneſs, cannot be-'ſtow an infinite good on a creature, who in his own perſon is 'entirely unworthy of it. It alſo ſuppoſes, that if ever God 'pardon any ſinner, he muſt pardon all, whoſe demerits are no 'more than that of the man pardoned; otherwiſe he is partial: 'and for the ſame reaſon, that if ever he condemn any ſinner, 'he muſt condemn all thoſe, whoſe characters are equally ſinful 'with that of the man condemned. But it is preſumed, that 'theſe ſentiments will be avowed by no man.'*

Objection 4. Dr. Chauncy ſays, 'In what point of light 'ſoever we take a view of *ſin*, it is certainly, in its nature, a *fi-'nite evil*. It is the fault of a finite creature, and the effect of 'finite principles, paſſions, and appetites. To ſay, therefore, 'that the ſinner is doomed to *infinite miſery* for the *finite* faults 'of a *finite* life, looks like a reflection on the infinite juſtice, as 'well as goodneſs of God.'†

Anſwer. This objection contains two arguments. Firſt, that creatures, becauſe they have finite powers and capacities, cannot commit a crime infinitely heinous. Secondly, that they cannot do that evil, in *finite life*, which deſerves endleſs puniſhment. As to the firſt of theſe, It is impoſſible that a finite injury ſhould be done to an infinite Being. All injuries done to God, muſt be infinite, otherwiſe they are not injuries done to him. Whatever is diſhonorary to him, is, in its own nature and tendency, an infinite evil. And would actually be productive of boundleſs miſchief, did not God defend himſelf, or retrieve his own honor. The leaſt ſtur caſt upon the character of the Supreme Being, ſhould he wholly paſs it over, this would totally alter his character, in the view of all his obedient ſubjects.— He would of courſe no longer be God. If, therefore, creatures cannot do that which tends to injure God to an infinite degree, becauſe they have *finite principles* and *paſſions*; by the ſame rule they can do him no diſhonor whatever; or they cannot ſin againſt him.

It

* *Ed. againſt Chauncy*, p. 85. † p. 319, 320.

It will here be ſaid, this does not affect the queſtion. The objection is, Finite creatures, with finite principles, &c. cannot do that which is deſerving *infinite miſery*. In reply to this, we have no rule to try the deſert of a crime, only by examining what the criminal has actually done, or what he has attempted to do. And the deſert of ſin, as we have already ſeen, does not depend on the degree of exiſtence the perſon has, who commits it; but on the character of him againſt whom it is committed. 'If a finite creature can affront and abuſe his 'Creator, who is infinitely worthy, he can be guilty of an in-'finite crime; becauſe the greatneſs of the injury does not ariſe 'from the greatneſs of him who offers it; but from the charac-'ter of him who is injured.'* 'If a creature ſhould actually 'put an end to his Maker's exiſtence, or dethrone him and de-'ſtroy his kingdom; his crime would be truly infinite, all will 'grant. But to deſire and attempt this, and do that which 'would certainly effect it, were it not prevented by a ſuperior 'power, is to be guilty of the ſame crime, ſo far as the crimi-'nal is concerned: and therefore muſt be infinitely great, and 'deſerve the ſame puniſhment, as if the effect had actually fol-'lowed.—Agreeably to this, when a crime is committed, men 'do not enquire into the greatneſs or ſmallneſs of the perpetra-'tor, in order to determine the magnitude of the crime; but 'conſider the nature of the crime, and the injury done, and 'who is injured, &c. If an abject, dependent ſlave, burns his 'maſter's houſe, and deſtroys him and his whole family, or at-'tempts to do it, his inferiority and dependence on his maſter, 'do not extenuate his crime, in the judgment of men, but rath-'er aggravate it: And no one will offer this as a plea in his fa-'vor, or as a reaſon for a mitigation of his puniſhment.'* It is therefore impoſſible to evade the force of the above cited law: 'Then ſhall ye do unto him, as he had *thought to have done* 'unto his brother. And thine eye ſhall not pity, but life ſhall 'go for life, eye for eye,' &c. As ſinners *have thought* to do unto God, or to Chriſt the Son of God, ſo they deſerve to be treated by him. They accordingly deſerve *infinite miſery*, or an interminable puniſhment. If we renounce this rule, we have none left, competent to try the nature of any crime.

As to the ſecond of theſe arguments, That ſinners cannot do that evil, in a finite life, which deſerves endleſs miſery;—this only makes another contradiction in Dr. Chauncy's ſcheme. He holds, the damned, for the faults of a finite life, deſerve to

* Dr. Hopkins's Enquiry. p. 131.

be annihilated.* This is really an unlimited puniſhment. For rational beings, made capable of *immortality*, having faculties of ſoul ſuited for endleſs happineſs; for them to be forever cut off from this happineſs, and cut off for their own faults, is indeed a puniſhment having no limits. To loſe an infinite or endleſs good, is an infinite loſs. So to have this good taken away, or to be cut off from it, as a puniſhment, is an unlimited puniſhment. It is as really ſo, in the nature of things, as it is to be puniſhed with miſery that has no end. Therefore, as Dr. C. holds that creatures, for the faults of a finite life, do deſerve annihilation, *non-exiſtence*; ſo he holds, they deſerve, for theſe faults, an infinite puniſhment. Which argues ſin to be infinitely criminal.

Dr. C. alſo holds, that the damned are delivered from hell, by *boundleſs* and *inexhauſtible* goodneſs, by the *utmoſt* bowels of the divine compaſſion, by the *infinite* indulgence and love of their Creator.† It belongs to him, or his diſciples, to ſhow how theſe epithets apply to the deliverance of the damned, when they, as he holds, are only guilty of the *finite* faults of a *finite* life.

Again, Dr. C. holds that men deſerve to be puniſhed for ages of ages, for the ſin they commit in this life. He evidently conſiders the deſert of ſin, in this caſe, without any regard to the length of time, in which it is committed. He conſiders the ill deſert of all ſinners to be greater or leſs, according 'to the 'nature and *number* of their evil deeds;'‡ whether more or leſs time has been ſpent for the commiſſion of theſe deeds. But if men deſerve to be puniſhed for ages of ages, for the ſins of this ſhort life, they certainly deſerve to be puniſhed longer than the time they were committing theſe ſins. Now if this may take place, in one inſtance, why not in another? And if men may be puniſhed one day over the time ſpent for the commiſſion of ſin, the deſert of ſuch puniſhment, why not two days, three days, and ſo on? or why may they not be puniſhed forever, for the ſin of one day? Adam was puniſhed all his days, for the crime of a few minutes, or a very ſhort time. 'Curſed is the ground 'for thy ſake; in ſorrow ſhalt thou eat of it all the days of thy 'life.'§ Upon Gehazi the ſervant of Eliſha, as in 2 Kings, v. 27, this curſe was denounced, 'The leproſy of Naaman ſhall 'cleave unto thee, and unto thy ſeed forever.' This puniſhment,

* He makes this his laſt reſort, provided the wicked are ſent to hell, as ſo many *abſolute incurables*. See p. 282. From which it is plain he holds they *deſerve* to be *annihilated*.

† p. 320, 405. ‡ p. 320. § Gen. 3. 17.

ment, in ſome ſenſe, had no bounds. For this diſeaſe was never to leave him nor his ſeed, till it had carried them off. And this was for a crime, ſuddenly committed. Chriſt ſaid of the ſin of blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt, it ſhould never be forgiven; neither in this world, nor in the world to come; or to an abſolute eternity, as has been ſhown. And this ſin is committed, ſeemingly in an inſtant of time.

There is ground to ſuppoſe, this objection never would have been thought of by Dr. C. had not his ſcheme been in diſtreſs. Who ever thought of enquiring into the length of time, conſumed in the commiſſion of a crime, to find out what puniſhment it deſerves? When a man has murdered his neighbor, or ſet the whole city on fire, who would think of aſking how long this culprit was in doing of it, in order to know what puniſhment to inflict upon him?—But the ſame argument will hold good here, as in anſwering the firſt part of this objection. If creatures cannot do an infinite diſhonor to God, in a finite life, they can of courſe do no kind of diſhonor to him. For no other than an infinite diſhonor can be done to him. Hence, this objection tends to explain away all ſin.

Objection 5. Dr. Chauncy ſays again, 'If ſin be an infinite 'evil, then all ſinners muſt ſuffer *to the utmoſt* in *degree*, as 'well as *duration*; otherwiſe, they will not ſuffer ſo much as 'they might do, and as they ought to do: Which is plainly in-'conſiſtent with the difference the ſcripture often declares there 'ſhall be in the puniſhment of wicked men.'*

Anſwer. This objection is groundleſs. No ſuch ſentiment has ever been advanced, by thoſe who hold ſin to be an infinite evil. Neither does the Doctor's conſequence follow, from any thing they have ſaid on this ſubject. Sin is an infinite evil, as we have ſeen, in the following reſpects. It is committed againſt the infinite God: It tends to do infinite miſchief: It deſerves infinite or endleſs puniſhment. But it does not from hence follow, that ſin is infinite *in degree*, that the damned muſt all ſuffer to the *utmoſt in degree*, and therefore all of them muſt ſuffer equally alike. This may be illuſtrated by the caſe of *high treaſon*. This crime, with regard to civil ſociety only, is the greateſt of all crimes. In this relation, the criminality of it cannot be increaſed; or no crime can be of a higher nature or kind. No higher obligation, relative to civil ſociety, can be violated. And this crime tends to do greater miſchief than any other; as it ſtrikes directly at the ſafety and happineſs, not only of individuals but of the whole community. Therefore,

* p. 320.

fore, it is followed with the moſt ſevere kind of puniſhment, which can be inflicted by the hand of man; it is puniſhed both with death andthe loſs of property. But it is verynatural to ſuppoſe a number may be combined in this ſame crime; and ſome one, or ſome part of them, far more criminal than the reſt. Their leaders may act againſt greater light and conviction than the reſt; and may be urged on with greater virulence and malignity, againſt the beſt intereſt of the nation. Their leaders may be at the bottom of the whole miſchief. Had it not been for thoſe few, the peace of the community would not have been diſturbed. Now, they all deſerve death, and the confiſcation of their lands and goods. But their leaders may juſtly be puniſhed with a more painful and diſgraceful death, than the reſt.

To apply this: Sin againſt God is a violation of an infinite obligation, as God is infinitely worthy. In this reſpect, the evil of ſin cannot be increaſed, it is indeed an infinite evil. It is alſo an infinite evil, as it tends to do infinite miſchief. It therefore deſerves endleſs puniſhment; the deſerved puniſhment cannot be increaſed, as to duration. But it is eaſy to conceive that ſome of the damned will have far greater puniſhment *in degree*, than others; though all will have the ſame as to duration. The reaſon for this is plain. Some have a greater degree of ſin, or oppoſition to holineſs, and act againſt greater light, than others. To ſuppoſe that the puniſhment of the damned cannot be increaſed, as to duration; but may be increaſed, as to *degrees* of miſery; is as plain a caſe as can be ſtated. It is equally plain that all ſin is infinitely criminal, in the ſeveral reſpects above mentioned; that is, every ſin, even the leaſt, violates the greateſt poſſible obligation, and tends to unbounded evil; and in theſe reſpects cannot be increaſed. Still there are degrees of pride, hatred, and enmity; conſequently degrees of criminality; deſert of greater or leſs degrees of that puniſhment which ſhall never end. As, therefore, *degrees* may be proportioned as widely different, as is poſſible for numbers to tell; ſo the puniſhment of the damned, to the deſert of each one, may be exactly proportioned. One may ſuffer ten thouſand or ten million times more than another; and both ſuffer alike, relative to duration. This may be the caſe, whether the puniſhment be limited in duration, or not. Hence there is no need of ſuppoſing that all who ſuffer endleſs miſery, muſt ſuffer the *utmoſt* in degree, and the ſame in degree; than that all who ſuffer for ages of ages, muſt ſuffer the ſame in degree. Dr. C. muſt find the ſame difficulty in his own ſcheme, as he would fix upon his opponents.

The

The above objection goes upon the ground, that all things which are infinite in ſome reſpects, are ſo in all reſpects; and are the ſame in all reſpects. Whereas nothing can be more falſe. A line or cord of half an inch diameter, and a cylinder of five feet diameter, both extending *ad infinitum*, or without end, are both the ſame in one reſpect; they agree in length. But who would from hence infer, they were both the ſame in every reſpect? An infinite line is the ſame as an infinite ſuperficies, in one reſpect. They are both the ſame in length, but as to breadth the latter infinitely exceeds the former. Again, an infinite ſuperficies is the ſame in length and breadth as an infinite ſolid; but in depth the former bears no proportion to the latter.* So ſin may be infinitely aggravated with reſpect to the object it is committed againſt, or the evil it tends to effect; and in this reſpect its aggravation cannot be increaſed.—Still it may not be infinite with reſpect to the *degree* of hatred and oppoſition to the object, againſt whom it is committed.

Theſe three laſt *objections* contain the ſum of Dr. C's reaſoning againſt the doctrine of the unlimited evil of ſin, and its deſert of interminable puniſhment. The Reader will find, in *Dr. Edwards againſt Dr. C.* Chap. iv, a more lengthy, and perhaps a more accurate *anſwer* to them, than is here given.

Objection 6. Dr. Prieſtly argues, that whereas there is no proportion between finite and infinite, nor between time and eternity; ſo finite beings in a finite life cannot deſerve an endleſs puniſhment.†

Anſwer. This being nearly the ſame objection over again, we have only to add—There is no proportion between God and the creature. The happineſs of God ſwallows up all proportion, when compared to the happineſs of a mere creature.—Therefore, when the ſinner would ſtrip God of his happineſs, to promote his own, he deſerves a puniſhment out of all proportion. A puniſhment out of all proportion, as to duration, or an endleſs one, is no more than anſwerable to the ſinner's deſert.

Objection 7. Mr. Wincheſter ſays, 'Two things that are 'diametrically oppoſite to each other, cannot both exiſt to all 'eternity: if they are both infinite, they will mutually deſtroy 'each other; if one be infinite, and the other finite, the finite 'muſt be deſtroyed; and which ever is moſt powerful, muſt 'deſtroy the other. Now ſince *holineſs* and *ſin*, *evil* and *good*, 'are exactly oppoſite one to the other; it is evident, one muſt 'at laſt prevail over the other, how long ſoever the contention

'and

* This illuſtration is uſed by Dr. Edwards and others.

† Inſtit. Vol ii p. 383.

'and strife may continue; and since *goodness* is the perfection 'of God, and *evil* the imperfection of the creature, there can 'be no doubt, that as good existed before evil, so it shall exist 'to all eternity, when evil shall be no more.'*—This, Mr. W. adds was 'one of the first arguments' that led him into the *universal scheme.*

Answer. The fallacy of this objection is very obvious. And, 1. We are to notice, it does not directly deny that sin deserves endless punishment; but asserts that it is impossible sin and misery, or *evil*, should continue without end. Divine goodness, because it is infinite, must necessarily destroy every finite thing that is directly opposed to it; and therefore must necessarily destroy sin and misery. Mr. W. does not say, nor even intimate that God is engaged, and certainly will do this, to answer some wise ends. But his argument is, 'Two things that 'are diametrically opposite to each other, *cannot* both exist to 'all eternity; if they are both infinite, they will mutually de-'stroy each other; if one be infinite, and the other finite, the 'finite *must* be destroyed; and which ever is most powerful, '*must* destroy the other.' Not the least intimation does he give, that God will certainly, or necessarily, because the public good requires it, destroy all that is opposed to him, or all evil. But he urges the necessity of the case, a blind necessity; or the impossibility of its being otherwise, from the nature of the case. As when two elements jar together, and that which is the least powerful cannot but give way, and be overcome. But, be this necessity of what kind it may, it must arise either from the nature of God or the creature, or both. And in either case it goes to destroy Mr. W's scheme. If in this matter, God acts from necessity, he is not praise worthy for this act. If he destroys all sin and misery, because he cannot do otherwise, there is no virtue in this act according to Mr. W's doctrine. So if sin is necessarily destroyed, and the sinner cannot possibly help forsaking all sin and turning to God, there is no virtue in this forced repentance, as Mr. W. calls it.

2. The above objection is not only a contradiction in Mr. W's and Dr. C's scheme, but it is a contradiction to Scripture. The sacred oracles represent sin and sinners as being absolutely dependent on God. And that he is able to continue them in existence, longer or shorter, or put them out of existence, just according to his pleasure. 'Arise go down to the potter's 'house, and there I will cause thee to hear my words.—O house 'of Israel, cannot I do with thee as this potter? saith the LORD. Behold,

* Dialogues, p. 40.

'Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, ſo are ye in mine 'hand, O houſe of Iſrael.'* What neceſſity has the potter to deſtroy his own veſſels? and whether they be veſſels of honor or diſhonor? Cannot he keep them for his own uſe, while he himſelf exiſts? Or cannot he deſtroy them, put them out of exiſtence, when he pleaſes? In like manner, Scripture invariably aſcribes liberty and power to God; for him to do with all his creatures as he pleaſes.

3. The ſame power which can, of itſelf, deſtroy ſin and miſery, is able to continue them in being. Or certainly this is true of almighty power. Therefore, as the Almighty is unchangeable, ſo if he is able to continue ſin and miſery in being, or deſtroy them to day, he is able to do the ſame to-morrow, and to all eternity. Certainly, Mr. W's ſcheme which goes to deny Omnipotency, which needs an atheiſtical argument to ſupport it, may juſtly be ſuſpected.

4. There was no neceſſity of a Mediator on Mr. W's plan, to redeem men from ſin and miſery. Theſe, as he argues, cannot poſſibly exiſt to all eternity, in oppoſition to divine goodneſs. On his plan, God muſt neceſſarily put an end to all ſin and miſery, or redeem men from them; and whether it be done with or without a Mediator.

5. The above objection, when applied, muſt give a wrong repreſentation of the ſtate of the damned. It muſt repreſent their ſin and miſery, as being oppoſed to God in ſuch manner, that he is obliged to deſtroy them for his own ſafety. He is neceſſitated to put ſin and miſery out of exiſtence, and deliver the damned from them, purely from principles of ſelf-defence. This is the language of the above objection: 'Two things di-'ametrically oppoſite to each other, cannot both exiſt to all e-'ternity.' As though the damned were not in chains, and under abſolute controul. As though God were not omnipotent, and as able to overrule ſin and miſery in hell, for his own honor, and to eternity, as he is in this world for an age. Again, the above objection repreſents the damned as being oppoſed to God, and carrying on a warfare againſt him, juſt as ſinners are in this world. Whereas the caſe is quite the reverſe. The hatred and blaſphemy of the damned, in connection with their puniſhment, has no tendency to diſhonor God. On the contrary, all the damned ſay and do, tends to his honor. As when a malefactor, faſt bound in chains, going to the place of execution: as when this pitiful wretch curſes his judge, curſes his jury, and vows vengeance to his country; this only declares to

the

* Jerem. 18. 2, 6.

the world the juſtice of that authority, which rids the world of ſuch a monſter. So when the damned vent out their horrid blaſphemy againſt God, inſtead of weakening and breaking down his authority, as ſinners do in this world; inſtead of this, their blaſphemy only returns on their own heads. It ſhows to the world what they would do to God, if they could. And therefore helps to illuſtrate his juſtice, in puniſhing them without end. So that the ſin of the damned, in connection with their miſery, inſtead of doing evil, does the greateſt good. It ſets off divine juſtice in the moſt amiable and glorious manner.

Puniſhment anſwerable to ſinners' deſerts, is an effectual antidote againſt their ſin, and completely bars it from doing evil. The caſe is infinitely different from what it is to take ſin ſeparately, or when it goes unpuniſhed. In this latter caſe ſin and ſinners reign, and trample on divine authority; they even doubt whether there is a God to judge the world, yea, they often queſtion the very being of a God. But where juſtice is fully executed, they are totally cured of ſuch doubts. To their ſorrow they know that there is a God. Accordingly, where juſtice is fully diſplayed, there God reigns, or juſtice is triumphant. And all that the damned can poſſibly do by their blaſphemy, is only to condemn themſelves out of their own mouths.

We have now, my dear Sir, gone over all the material objections, brought againſt this doctrine. And, becauſe ſin tends to do infinite miſchief, to root holineſs entirely out of the world, and make God and ſaints miſerable forever; it is evident, beyond all contradiction, that ſinners are infinitely criminal, and deſerving of endleſs puniſhment. From hence it is infered with certainty, that part of mankind, and all the damned, will ſuffer without end. For the Scripture plainly aſſerts that ſome of mankind ſhall ſuffer their full deſert. And as they deſerve endleſs puniſhment, and ſhall poſitively ſuffer all they deſerve, it is undeniable that they will ſuffer to an abſolute eternity.—The places of Scripture, which expreſsly declare that impenitent ſinners ſhall ſuffer the full wages of their ſins, are the following:—Eccl. xii. 14. 'God ſhall bring every work into 'judgment, with every ſecret thing, whether it be good, or 'whether it be bad.' Iſai. iii. 11. 'Wo unto the wicked, it 'ſhall be ill with him: For the *reward* of his hands ſhall be 'given him.' Pſal. xxviii. 4. 'Give them according to their 'deeds, and according to the wickedneſs of their endeavors:—'give them after the work of their hands, render to them their '*deſert*.' Matt. xvi. 27. 'For the Son of man ſhall come in 'the glory of his Father, with his angels: And then he ſhall

reward

'*reward* every man according to his works.'* Rom. ii. 5, 6, 9. 'But after thy hardneſs and impenitent heart, treaſureſt up 'wrath againſt the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous 'judgment of God; who *will render* to every man *according* '*to his deeds.* Tribulation and wrath upon every ſoul of man 'that doth evil.' 2 Cor. v. 10. 'For we muſt all appear be-'fore the judgment ſeat of Chriſt: That every one *may receive* '*the things done in the body, according to that he hath done,* '*whether it be good or bad.*' Rev. xviii. 6, 7. '*Reward her* '*even as ſhe rewarded you.* How much ſhe hath glorified 'herſelf, and lived deliciouſly, *ſo much torment and ſorrow* '*give her.*' Rev. xx. 12. 'And the dead were judged out of 'thoſe things that were written in the books, *according to their* '*works.*'—*Good* deeds and *bad* are here given as a diſtinction between *believers* and *unbelievers*; and their oppoſite *rewards.* As in John iii. 36. 'He that believeth on the Son 'hath everlaſting life: and he that believeth not the Son ſhall 'not ſee life.'

From the above, the conſiſtency of endleſs puniſhment with *full atonement*, naturally follows. As,

1. Men juſtly deſerve this puniſhment. This puniſhment can do them no injury, but is perfectly conſiſtent with their deſert. In this very material article, that is, with regard to their deſert, endleſs puniſhment is therefore conſiſtent. And it is ſo notwithſtanding full atonement; for full atonement does not render their ſin leſs ſinful or ill deſerving. It makes proviſion for all ſuch as forſake their ſins, to eſcape from their juſt deſert; but it cannot alter their deſert, any more than it can turn ſin into holineſs.

2. If ſin is infinitely criminal, and the finally impenitent receive the full wages of their ſins, as has been ſhown; then the atonement has made no proviſion for theſe characters, as ſuch, to ſave them from their juſt deſert. And this agrees with ſcripture. The blood of Chriſt has opened the way for all men, to turn from ſin and find mercy; yet the ſame awful curſe lies againſt ſuch as remain impenitent, as though no atonement for ſin were made. 'He that believeth not, ſhall be damned.'†

3. If ſin is infinitely criminal, and the day of judgment is the time fixed, for ſuch as are found in their ſins, to receive their full reward; then are they, at this ſolemn criſis, totally cut off from the benefits of Chriſt's death, and muſt remain un-

* Though this refers to Chriſt's coming to deſtroy Jeruſalem, &c. yet its complete fulfilment will be, when Chriſt comes to judge the world, at the laſt day.

† Mark 16. 16.

der the curſe of God's law forever. How can the debtor ever be liberated from priſon, when he owes an infinite debt, and ſhall not come out thence, till he has paid the *uttermoſt farthing?* But all ſuch as die in their ſins, are then found at the day of judgment, with all their ſins upon them. Therefore, death totally cuts off the impenitent, and fixes them for the laſt judgment. This was, perhaps, made evident in Part I. Let. III. to which the reader is refered. And as God will, at the final judgment, render to his enemies according to their deſert, by dooming them *to everlaſting fire*, ſo this will be conſiſtent. What the Judge of all the earth will do, at that day, will be *right*, and conſiſtent with complete atonement.

4. If ſin is an unlimited evil, and deſerves endleſs puniſhment, as has been proved; and the great Judge will, at the laſt day, *render tribulation and wrath* upon his enemies, or render to all thoſe on his left hand *according to their deeds;* then are we warranted to take the words, cloſing the tremendous ſcene, in their plain and literal ſenſe: Matt. xxv. 46. 'Theſe ſhall 'go away into everlaſting puniſhment: but the righteous into 'life eternal.' If we grant ſin to be infinitely criminal, and that the Judge of all will then deal with his enemies according to their works, which things cannot be denied; we are obliged to take theſe words literally, ſo as to intend an abſolute eternity, as to the wicked, as well as to the righteous. The reaſon given why the wicked are ſentenced to this puniſhment, is becauſe they have ſlighted and deſpiſed Chriſt, or ſlighted and deſpiſed his complete atonement: 'I was an hungred, and ye 'gave me no meat,' &c. Therefore, notwithſtanding complete atonement, and becauſe they have trampled it under foot, their everlaſting puniſhment is perfectly conſiſtent.

5. If ſin is infinitely criminal, then God, who has no pleaſure in the death of the wicked, glorifies his juſtice on the damned out of pure neceſſity.* It is neceſſary, though the atonement be complete he ſhould, in this way, ſhow his infinite hatred to ſin, becauſe ſin is an infinite evil; and becauſe he could not

* God is at the fartheſt remove from a neceſſity from blind fate. He is, however, under an infinite neceſſity, from his own infinite benevolence to do all which is beſt. To effect the beſt end, he is therefore under an infinite neceſſity to uſe the beſt means. For creatures can have knowledge only by means; this is evident from experience. God has knowledge intuitively, or without means. But it is not poſſible creatures ſhould have knowledge in the manner God has. For it is not poſſible creatures ſhould be as God, or any thing more than creatures. By the immediate agency of his Spirit, God creates an heart in man, for them to improve means rightly, and exerciſe faith in Chriſt. But without means there is no right improvement, nor no knowledge of any kind, except in God the ſource of all knowledge. Hence, the neceſſity of God's uſing means ſuited to the capacity of creatures.

not otherwiſe anſwer all the ſame ends, or glorify his juſtice to ſo good advantage.

That God does glorify his juſtice on the damned, is evident. Rom. ix. 22. 'What if God, willing to ſhow his wrath, and to 'make his power known, endured with much longſuffering the 'veſſels of wrath fitted to deſtruction.' Theſe words, 'veſſels of wrath,' mean ſuch as are uſed for God to diſplay his wrath upon; being put to no other uſe. And from Rom. ii. 1—16, it is plain that they have been appointed for 'the day of *wrath* 'and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will 'render to every man according to his deeds,' &c. Therefore, although in Rom. ix. there is mention of the deſtruction of Pharaoh, and reference to what was coming on the Jews in this world, yet theſe things are to illuſtrate the ſtate of the damned. Accordingly, theſe *veſſels of wrath* ultimately intend the damned. And 'endured with much long ſuffering the veſſels of 'wrath fitted to deſtruction,' certainly intends the damned, taken from among men. Now God *ſhows* his wrath on theſe *veſſels;* he does not conceal it, but ſhows it; and makes his power known. He makes known what his hatred to ſin is, by puniſhing the damned. Which is the ſame as glorifying his juſtice upon them. Which alſo is to ſhow the nature and extent of his wrath againſt ſin; or juſt what his wrath againſt ſin is. If he does not ſhow the nature and extent of his hatred to ſin or his wrath juſt as it is, he does not ſhow *divine* wrath, but ſomething elſe. He therefore ſhows his *wrath to the uttermoſt.** In other words, by puniſhing the damned, he ſhows juſt what they deſerve. This proves at once, as they deſerve infinite evil, ſo is their puniſhment infinite in duration; and divine juſtice is herein made glorious.

But inſpiration has here ſilenced every objection. 'What 'if God, willing to ſhow his wrath,' &c. What if God does this? Where is the inconſiſtency? He does theſe veſſels of wrath no injury. He waits on his enemies *with much longſuffering*. As ſure as he lives, he has no pleaſure in the death of the wicked. Could he glorify his juſtice in the ſame advantageous manner, and anſwer all the valuable ends, without the puniſhment of the damned, he certainly would. Where then is the objection? His ſhowing the infinite greatneſs and terribleneſs of his wrath on the damned, confirms all his awful threatenings againſt ſinners, and places it beyond diſpute what divine hatred to ſin is. Which gives a character moſt grand, amiable, and important. What branch of the divine character is more amiable and important than his infinite hatred to ſin?

But

* 1 Theſ. 2. 16

But what if God is willing to make this known? What if he is willing to make it known, in the moſt indiſputable manner? Who is injured? The damned are not. And who will complain? Verily none except ſuch as love ſin. And what if Wiſdom has choſen the beſt way, or his own way, to reveal the nature of divine juſtice? Or what if God has taken the moſt effectual way to reveal himſelf, as the true God? It is impoſſible for him to appear as the true God, a God of infinite holineſs, unleſs he ſhows his real hatred to ſin. That is, after ſin once exiſts. All his declarations and threatenings againſt ſin come to nothing, unleſs they are executed. Or unleſs he makes ſome examples of juſtice. What then, ſhall God reveal himſelf to be the true God, or ſhall he not? *The fool* has a negative anſwer; he *hath ſaid in his heart, No God.* But where, it is again aſked, is there any inconſiſtency? There is none with relation to the atonement. For if the atonement were not complete, God could not endure with much longſuffering, ſuch as are afterwards made veſſels of wrath. His enduring in this manner, implies that they have a day of grace, and offers of ſalvation.

Furthermore, God ſhows his wrath to the uttermoſt, on the veſſels of wrath, 'that he might make known the riches of his 'glory on the veſſels of mercy, which he had afore prepared 'unto glory.' Though reference is here had to the happy ſtate of goſpel times, ſtill this looks forward to, and chiefly intends, the heavenly ſtate. Where the riches of divine glory are completely diſplayed, upon the veſſels of mercy prepared unto glory. But who will complain of this? Inſpiration propoſes this everlaſting good on the redeemed, occaſioned by the ſufferings of the damned, as ſufficient to ſilence every objection. Indeed, when God does no injury to the damned, and by their endleſs miſery occaſions this good to the redeemed forever, who can complain? Not only ſo, if wiſdom and benevolence do this, we are aſſured it is according to divine wiſdom and benevolence; ſo no alteration can be made for the better.

It is here remarkable, a diſplay of the riches of divine glory, on the veſſels of mercy, is not only conſiſtent with complete atonement, but proves it to be complete. Therefore, the *way* wiſdom takes to do this, muſt be conſiſtent with complete atonement. Which is to glorify divine juſtice by the ſufferings of the damned, as well as by the ſufferings and death of Chriſt. Not that the ſufferings of the damned make a part of the atonement, but they are neceſſary to ſhow the nature of divine wrath againſt

againſt the ſin of deſpiſing atoning righteouſneſs. Beſides, theſe ſufferings of the damned prove the atonement to be complete. For the damned are found guilty of the blood of Chriſt. Or guilty of ſinning againſt God's *long ſuffering*, which amounts to the ſame. And if they are guilty of the blood of Chriſt, and God ſhows his wrath upon them for this ſin, then this blood, had they waſhed in it, was ſufficient to take away their ſin.

But it is in vain to pretend, the atonement is not complete, if ſome men are eternally damned, when divine *long ſuffering* proves the contrary. It is in vain to pretend, if the atonement be complete, the ſufferings of the damned can be of no uſe, when wiſdom aſſigns ſuch an important uſe; even to make known the riches of his glory, on the veſſels of mercy prepared unto glory.

On the whole, it cannot be denied but that God ſhows his wrath on one, to make known the riches of his grace on another. He makes one miſerable, to enhance the happineſs of another. This goes to ruin, totally, the univerſal ſcheme. For if God, to this end, makes one miſerable, even for one day, why not for eternal days? And why not *render to them their deſert?* Why not ſhow his real nature, the *utmoſt* of his wrath againſt ſin? Or the excellency and glory of his juſtice? Grace indeed appears rich and glorious, when juſtice appears to the beſt advantage.

6. If ſin is an infinite evil, the atonement itſelf, that its value might be ſeen in the cleareſt manner, makes the endleſs miſery of the damned neceſſary.

We muſt grant that the works of God give additional force to his words. When God declares ſome truth by words, theſe words are ſufficient to command our belief. But when he declares the ſame thing over again by works, this gives additional force to his words; yea this gives the higheſt kind of evidence, we are capable of conceiving. So when God reveals, in his *ſacred word*, his infinite hatred to ſin, and its infinite criminality, this is ſufficient to command our belief. But when he declares the ſame by works, in condemning the impenitent, and ſending them away into everlaſting puniſhment, this gives the higheſt poſſible evidence that ſin is infinitely criminal, and deſerving of this puniſhment. Now, this helps to ſhow the real value of the atonement, and to the beſt advantage. Certainly if the redeemed in heaven know what the damned in hell ſuffer, they alſo know, and it is to them beyond diſpute what they themſelves

ſelves deſerve. They therefore have the beſt advantage to ſee the infinite value of the atonement, the price which has bought them off from this eternal or infinite evil. And they could not have all the ſame advantages, to ſee the fulneſs of the atonement, were it not for the eternal ſufferings of the damned. This muſt be granted, unleſs we would deny that the *works* of God can give energy to his *words*. And unleſs we would hold that God does, in vain, ſhow his wrath, and make his power known, on the veſſels of wrath.

But it is perfectly agreeable to infinite benevolence, yea infinite benevolence appears to require it, that the value of the atonement ſhould be made known in the moſt convincing manner. In proportion as this is made known, ſo is Chriſt revealed to be the Son of God, a divine perſon, equal with God the Father. Alſo, in the ſame proportion are the riches of divine grace made known, on the veſſels of mercy. But if the end be agreeable to, and required by, infinite benevolence, ſo are the neceſſary means to effect this end. Hence, infinite benevolence, to effect ſo deſirable an end, requires that the damned never be releaſed from their torments.

7. A diſpenſation of grace, above all others, requires penal laws and puniſhments, equal to the deſert of crimes; eſpecially the crime of rejecting free grace. Becauſe this is the moſt aggravated of all crimes. Therefore, above all others, ſhould be noticed and puniſhed, if continued in, agreeably to its deſert. Hence, the things which Univerſaliſts would build upon, to ſecure themſelves in their ſins, and ward off all conviction, are the very things which render their caſe peculiarly alarming and dangerous. They preſume upon free grace, infinite benevolence, and full atonement: not conſidering, that, while theſe things open a door for all men to repent, they make ſure the endleſs damnation of the finally impenitent. Not conſidering, if men perſevere in trampling under foot the blood of the ſon of God, this blood will certainly be required at their hands.

But, my friend, protracting this letter by meeting ſo many objections, I have more than wearied your patience. It may be uſeful, however, to ſee what ſin is, what it deſerves, and the certain doom of irreclaimable ſinners. Let us now bring the matter home to our own ſouls.—Our ſins are as countleſs as the duſt of the earth: every ſin an infinite evil, or meriting miſery which never ends. What then is our caſe if we have no intereſt in Chriſt? And, O the thought of remaining out of Chriſt another moment! can we be content to expoſe our-

ſelves

ſelves another moment to the wrath of an infinite God? And when he offers to make his grace glorious in our ſalvation? can we content ourſelves, in hating the bleſſed Jeſus another moment?

I am, &c.

LETTER IV.

Containing an explanation of the Second Death.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

THE ſubject becomes ſtill more ſerious. And, if any thing is ſuited to awaken our attention, it muſt be this, a view of the *ſecond death.*

This *death* is four times mentioned in ſcripture. Rev. ii. 11. 'He that overcometh ſhall not be hurt of the ſecond death.' Rev. xx. 6, 14. 'Bleſſed and holy is he that hath part in the firſt 'reſurrection: on ſuch the ſecond death hath no power. And 'death and hell were caſt into the lake of fire. This is the ſe-'cond death.' Rev. xxi. 8. 'But the fearful and unbeliev-'ing, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, 'and ſorcerers and idolaters, and all liars, ſhall have their part 'in the lake that burneth with fire and brimſtone: which is the 'ſecond death.' This ſtriking figure, a 'lake that burneth with 'fire and brimſtone,' ſhows us how great and dreadful is the torment of the damned. What finiſhes the dreadful ſcene, they ſhall never be releaſed from their torments. 'And the devil that 'deceived them (Gog and Magog, ſo all irreclaimable ſinners) 'was caſt into a lake of fire and brimſtone, where the beaſt and 'falſe prophet are, and ſhall be tormented day and night forever 'and ever.' Rev. xx. 10. In the ſame ſenſe the Jews underſtood this phraſe, *the ſecond death*, to mean a death from which there is no recovery. They uſed 'this phraſe proverbially for 'final, utter, irreverſible deſtruction. So in the *Jeruſalem* 'Targum, Deut. xxxiii. 6. *Let Reuben live, and let him not* 'die the ſecond death, *by which the wicked die in the world* 'to come. Where, whatſoever be ſignified among them by 'the world to come, it ſeems to denote ſuch a death from which 'there is no releaſe.'* But the preſent deſign is,

1. To ſhow that this death is the *death* of both ſoul and body.

2. That this death conſiſts in complete *torment* of both ſoul and body.

3. Enquire

* *Dr. Hammond's Annotat.* on Rev. xx. 6.

3. Enquire what things are neceſſary to effect, and complete this *torment*.

I. This death is the *death* of both ſoul and body. The truth of which is clear from the following.

1. Matt. x. 28. 'Fear not them which kill the body, but 'are not able to kill the ſoul: but rather fear him which is able 'to *deſtroy both ſoul and body in hell.*' Granting this to be a threatening to ſome, and a warning to all, ſtill the account we have ſeen of the laſt judgment ſhows how it will actually be executed on unprofitable ſervants. Which gives weight to this threatening. That is, it is grounded on fact. Were not this threatening in one inſtance executed, and of courſe no danger that it ever would be, on one of our race, it would be totally groundleſs. But ſoul and body are here diſtinctly mentioned, both of which being deſtroyed together. The word, *deſtroy*, in this place, implies *death*; or the ſecond death is inflicted on ſoul and body. Alſo, *hell* here means ſomething beyond the grave. Men are able to kill our bodies, and caſt them into the grave; But God only has power to caſt into hell. Hence, from this notable ſaying of Chriſt taken with the account of the day of judgment, it is clear that both ſoul and body are caſt into hell; the ſecond death is inflicted on the former as well as the latter.

2. Rev. xix. 20. 'Theſe both were caſt alive into a lake of 'fire burning with brimſtone.' Theſe words, *caſt alive*, evidently mean ſoul and body.

3. All the threatenings which look forward to the final judgment, plainly apply to both ſoul and body.

4. As ſoul and body have ſinned together, ſo it is fitting they ſhould both ſuffer together.

5. The damned cannot poſſibly be puniſhed according to their deſert, only as ſoul and body are puniſhed together. This is clear from the nature of the caſe.

6. The account we have of the reſurrection from the dead, of the laſt judgment, and of the ſentence on the damned, makes it exceeding plain that both ſoul and body are included. And this is allowed by all who hold to future puniſhment.

II. It is deſigned to ſhow that this death conſiſts in complete *torment* of both ſoul and body.—Complete torment here means that every part of the body and the whole ſoul are filled with pain. That pain which is illuſtrated by the agonies of death. This is one reaſon why the torments of the damned are called the *ſecond death*: being one continued death; a ſinking dying diſtreſs, dreadful beyond conception!—Of which the following things give convincing proof.

1. Every

1. Every image, figure, illuſtration, and expreſſion is uſed, which is in the power of language to uſe, to give us the idea of complete torment. Some of which are,—'A fire is kindled in 'mine anger, (ſaith the LORD,) and ſhall burn to the loweſt 'hell. I will heap miſchiefs upon them, I will ſpend mine ar-'rows upon them. They ſhall be burnt with hunger, and de-'voured with burning heat, and bitter deſtruction.' 'If I 'whet my glittering ſword, and mine hand take hold on judg-'ment, I will render vengeance to mine enemies, and will re-'ward them that hate me.'* 'The enemies of the LORD ſhall 'be as the fat of lambs; they ſhall conſume, into ſmoke ſhall 'they conſume away.'† 'Tophet is ordained of old;—he hath 'made it deep and large; the pile thereof is fire and much 'wood; the breath of the LORD, like a ſtream of brimſtone, 'doth kindle it.'‡ 'My ſword ſhall be bathed in heaven; be-'hold, it ſhall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people 'of my curſe, to judgment. The ſword of the LORD is filled 'with blood.'§ At the end of the world, the angels ſhall come 'forth, and ſever the wicked from among the juſt, and ſhall 'caſt them into the furnace of fire; there ſhall be wailing and 'gnaſhing of teeth.'‖ 'Into the fire that never ſhall be quench-'ed: Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quench-'ed.'¶ 'And the ſmoke of their torment aſcendeth up forever 'and ever.' 'Theſe both were *caſt alive*, (that is, full of ſen-'ſation) into a lake of fire burning with brimſtone.'()—Theſe, and many others, give us an idea of complete torment, as ſtrik-ing and awful as is poſſible for us to have.

2. As the damned are totally ſinful, and their ſin an infinite evil, and as they receive the full wages of their ſins, ſo their torment muſt be full, or complete. For it muſt be anſwerable to their ſins. And God inflicts it, not becauſe he delights in their miſery, but to ſhow his hatred to ſin—*to ſhow his wrath.*—Now if God ſhows his wrath, he ſhows it as it is. This om-nipotent wrath therefore, which is unalterable, fills ſoul and body with deadly anguiſh; the *veſſels of wrath* are filled with *the wrath* of the Almighty. 'In the cup ſhe hath filled, fill 'to her double. How much ſhe hath glorified herſelf, and liv-'ed deliciouſly, ſo much torment and ſorrow give her.' |

3. Pſal. lxxiii, 19. 'How are they brought into deſolation, 'in a moment! they are utterly conſumed with terrors.' 2 Pet. ii, 12. 'And ſhall utterly periſh in their own corruption.'—

T T This

* Deut. 32. 22, 23, 24, 41. † Pſal. 37. 20. ‡ Iſai. 30. 33. § Iſai. 34. 5. ‖ Matt. 8. 49, 50. ¶ Mark 9. 43. 44. () Rev. 14. 11, and 19. 20. | Rev. 18. 6, 7.

This is explained in Rev. xiv, 14. 'The ſmoke of their tor-'ment aſcendeth up forever and ever: and they have no reſt 'day nor night, who worſhip the beaſt and his image.' So in ch. xx, 10. 'And ſhall be tormented day and night forever and 'ever.' The damned, therefore, are not annihilated. But their happineſs is *utterly conſumed*, or taken away. They have *no reſt*, not the leaſt poſſible relief, *day nor night*; nothing but the unremitting pangs and *terrors* of death for their portion.

4. It is ſaid of irreclaimable ſinners, their end is deſtruction,* and, compared to briars and thorns their end is to be burned,† and they are veſſels of wrath, as we have often ſeen, *fitted* to deſtruction; ſo of Pharaoh, 'Even for this ſame purpoſe have I raiſed thee up.'‡ From which it is evident, the damned are put to no other uſe but ſuffering. And their whole faculties of ſoul and body are employed for this uſe; otherwiſe they would be uſeleſs; and would anſwer no end. Therefore, their ſuffering, both of body and mind, muſt be according to their capacity. Like veſſels filled up to the brim, they are filled with the tortures of death itſelf.

5. One reaſon why God employs the damned only for the uſe of ſuffering, is to make his *power known*. He therefore makes it known upon them to the *uttermoſt*. And indeed it is a moſt convincing diſplay of God's power for him to keep ſoul and body together; to keep them in exiſtence, under ſuch inconceivable torments. Conſtantly weeping and wailing, groaning out under the agonies of death! or they are ever dying, and ever living only to die. They are conſumed away like ſmoke, *utterly* conſumed, and *utterly* deſtroyed. Yet God upholds them, or keeps them in being, in the midſt of this deſtruction. Which is demonſtration of his power. For ſoul and body *alive*, full of quick ſenſation, far more ſo perhaps than what we ever feel in this life; thus to be caſt into a lake of fire burning with brimſtone, and ſtill kept in being; what an awful view does this give of almighty power!

This ſo far from being a wanton diſplay of power, is ſuited to anſwer the higheſt ends of benevolence. The enemies of God are diſpoſed to mock, and defy his power. It therefore tends to the greateſt good, to have the world know that the LORD God is *ſtrong in judgment*: That he has *power to caſt into hell*, or to puniſh his implacable enemies equal to their deſert. The heavenly hoſts rejoice at this, and ſing, 'Allelu-'ia: for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.'§ One end alſo, which

* Phil. 3. 19. † Heb. 6. 8. ‡ Rom. 9. 17 § Rev. 19. 6.

which God has in puniſhing his enemies, is to make *them know* his greatneſs and power, as well as to make his power and glory known to his friends. Thus to Pharaoh, Exod. ix. 14, 16. 'For 'I will at this time ſend all my plagues upon thine heart; and 'upon thy ſervants, and upon thy people; that *thou mayeſt* '*know* that there is none like me in all the earth. And in very 'deed for this cauſe have I raiſed thee up, for to ſhew in thee 'my power; and that my name may be declared throughout all 'the earth.'*

As this is given to illuſtrate the ſtate of the damned, ſo God diſplays the full weight of his power upon them. He fills up the meaſure of their iniquity; which muſt make their torments *full*. And as they know the arm of God is ſtrong, ſo their courage is broken, and they are *cruſhed*. Not only ſo, their very pains make them know what almighty power is, their ſpirits

* Mr. Wincheſter in his Dialogues, ſo in his Lectures, wou'd ſupport his ſcheme from ſome of the threatenings. God gave out to the perverſe Iſraelites and idolatrous Gentiles; and becauſe ſuch threatenings are cloſed with theſe words, 'Ye ſhall know 'that I am the LORD.' As in Ezek. vii. 9, 27. 'I will ſhortly pour out my fury up-'on thee, and recompenſe mine anger upon thee.—Mine eye ſhall not ſpare, neither 'will I have pity; I will recompenſe thee according to thy ways;—and ye ſhall 'know that I am the LORD that ſmiteth.—I will do unto them after their way, and 'according to their deſerts will I judge them; and they ſhall know that I am the 'LORD.' Theſe, and many others of like import in this prophecy, Mr. W. takes to be promiſes of grace; the judgments here threatened being as he ſays, ſuited ſolely to humble, ſubdue, and bring to the ſaving knowledge of the LORD, and with this promiſe, 'Ye ſhall know that I am the LORD.' This he concludes muſt be taken as a promiſe of this ſort: becauſe, as he holds, wherever ſcripture ſpeaks of knowing the LORD, or ſays, 'Ye ſhall know that I am the LORD.' Or, it always, without exception, means, to know him in an holy or ſaving manner. See in his 28th *Lecture, Vol.* 2. alſo in his *Dialogues*, p. 115. But his reaſoning on this point, and through ſeveral pages, is totally overthrown by the above inſtance of Pharaoh. The LORD brought the threatened judgment upon him, and hardened his heart more and more, inſtead of making him know the LORD in a ſaving manner. Inſtead of this the LORD made Pharaoh know, to his deſtruction, what almighty power is. And made him an awful example, to illuſtrate the ſtate of the damned. Furthermore, the *confeſſion* Pharaoh made, was *to the glory of God the Father*. Exod. ix. 27. 'And Pharaoh ſent, and 'called for Moſes and Aaron, and ſaid unto them, I have ſinned this time: the LORD 'is righteous, and I and my people are wicked.' So the devils confeſſed, Luke iv. '33, 34. 'A ſpirit of an unclean devil—cried out with a loud voice, ſaying—What 'have we to do with thee, thou Jeſus of Nazareth? Art thou come to deſtroy us? 'I know who thou art, the Holy One of God.' That Chriſt ſhould appear to have power over devils, as well as over wicked men, and that they themſelves ſhould declare it, in this manner, is undoubtedly to the glory of God the Father. Theſe things alſo illuſtrate and give evidence what will be the caſe at the judgment day; when devils and wicked men, though their hearts will be hardened more and more, will be convicted, and ſome way made to acknowledge, or confeſs, the power and righteouſneſs of Chriſt the judge. This alſo totally overthrows all Dr. C. and Mr. W. have argued from Iſai. xlv. 23, and Phil. ii. 10, 11. For the entire ſtrength of their argument is, that this confeſſion always means voluntary ſubmiſſion. Whereas, in the two inſtances before us, they confeſs *Jeſus Chriſt is* LORD, while their hearts are wholly ſet againſt him.

its therefore can no longer bear up; they ſink, they die, they are utterly conſumed with terrors!

It is evident from experience, that poſitive knowledge of almighty power is as neceſſary to effect complete miſery, as it is to effect complete happineſs. Poſitive knowledge alſo of almighty power is as capable of effecting the former, in one caſe, as it is the latter in another. Therefore, when God threatened Pharaoh, which threatening was executed, that he ſhould know his power, and that his power ſhould be made known in him; he threatened to make him utterly miſerable. In this ſenſe it is explained by the apoſtle, Rom. ix.

6. The phraſe *death*, or *the ſecond death*, demands more particular notice. This phraſe undoubtedly has its meaning, as all words of ſcripture have. But the ſole meaning or uſe of it muſt be to ſhow the nature and extent of the miſery, ſuffered by the miſerable, in hell. For it cannot mean a deſtruction of ſoul and body, or that death puts an end to their exiſtence. Neither can it mean a ſeparation of ſoul and body. Neither can it mean that ſoul and body, or either of them, ceaſe to have life or being for a while; as the body does while in the grave. And, laſtly, it cannot mean a mere tranſition, paſſing from one ſtate to another. This the apoſtle expreſsly teaches, (1 Cor. xv. 51.) cannot be called death, or ſleep, which is here the ſame; but only being 'changed.' This *phraſe*, *death*, muſt of courſe be taken as an explanation of the miſery juſt named; otherwiſe it can be of no uſe. Dr. Chauncy takes it in the ſame ſenſe; although he again contradicts himſelf. 'The going away,' he ſays, 'into everlaſting puniſhment, the being 'caſt into the furnace of fire, where there ſhall be wailing and 'gnaſhing of teeth, mean the ſame thing in the ſacred dialect, 'with the *ſecond death*.'* Therefore, without falling into contradictions, we can do no other than conſider it as deſigned to ſhow the nature and extent of the torments of hell.

But the term *death* in ſcripture, ſo in common language, is uſed to give the moſt formidable idea of pain. To deſcribe ſickneſs or pain in the ſtrongeſt manner poſſible, we ſay, 'It is 'like death!'—Thus we have the ſtate of the miſerable, in the world of miſery; the ſtrongeſt of all expreſſions being uſed, to aſſure us the veſſels are filled full—their miſery of ſoul and body completed. Neither can we give any other interpretation to the words, *ſecond death*.

There are degrees of this miſery, as has often been ſaid. Of the poiſon of two full veſſels, that of one may be far more poiſonous

* p. 210.

ſonous than that of the other. Two veſſels may both be filled with liquid fire, and the fire in one vaſtly more intenſe and devouring than the fire in the other. This is evident, as alſo one veſſel may contain more in quantity than another. But the loweſt degree of this miſery, or torment, is worſe than non-exiſtence; the loweſt degree of it is *death*.

III. We are to enquire, what things are neceſſary to effect, and complete this *torment*.

Some things that go into the dreadful account, we have already ſeen. As, 'a lake of fire burning with brimſtone, a furnace of fire.' &c. 'If theſe are to be taken as in ſome meaſure metaphorical expreſſions; yet we muſt not think that they are deſigned to repreſent to our view an imagination, the ſufferings of the wicked as greater and more dreadful, than they really will be; for this is not conſiſtent with the dignity and truth of God, to attempt to frighten men, by threatening them with a greater evil than he ever will inflict on any; or by repreſenting them as ſuffering more than the wicked will ſuffer.'* The truth is, as awful and tremendous as the repreſentation, given by a lake of fire, is, it is no more than anſwerable to the idea of the ſecond death. Yea, the former is neceſſary to the latter. In common caſes, the ſtruggles, groans, and pangs of dying perſons are not continual; but by turns, with intermiſſions of ſome reſt or relief. But the ſecond death is continual, or unremitting: *they have no reſt day nor night.* So when one is caſt alive into a fire, the fire cauſes quick and raging pain, without intermiſſion. Hence, a lake of fire burning with brimſtone, or ſomething equal, appears conſiſtent and neceſſary to the ſecond death—to the torment of the damned.

Whatever it may be, which God has ordained, to make hell a place of miſery; or however it may differ from things diſcernible by our preſent ſenſes; yet it is *ſomething*, ſome material ſubſtance, ſuited to cauſe extreme anguiſh, ſo as the moſt glowing, piercing fire. Divine wiſdom has not deſcribed it more awful than it is. Neither can any thing exceed the caſe before us. What can be more painful than one continual, agonizing death! What, therefore, is called 'a lake of fire burning with brimſtone,' is ſome material ſubſtance, ſuited to torment the body. And is the ſame that God of old prepared for the puniſhment of devils. The wicked will be raiſed, at the laſt day, with bodies fitted to feel pain, and to receive this doom:—'Depart from me, ye curſed, into everlaſting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.' This fire could not puniſh the ſoul

or

* Dr. Hopkin's *Syſtem*, p. 253, vol. 2. By the wicked, he means the damned

or ſpirit, were it not for its union with the body. In the preſent ſtate, there are things to afflict the body; things which could not reach the mind, only through the medium of the body. So there are things to afflict the mind, which could have no operation upon the body, only as they firſt take hold of the mind.—It will undoubtedly be the ſame in the next ſtate. In both ſtates, however, what cauſes pain to one, does to the other;—for body and ſpirit are in the cloſeſt union. Hence, it is plain that this *fire*, or ſome material ſubſtance equal to it, is neceſſary to make hell what it is; a place, a mean, to take hold of and puniſh the body as well as the mind.

'As the wicked are to ſuffer in the body, they will be capable of ſuffering by means of the body, or of ſuffering bodily pain, as well as that which is purely mental.—The bodies of the wicked will be raiſed, and united to their ſouls, that they may be puniſhed, and ſuffer miſery in body and mind, in union. And God can render a future ſeparation impoſſible, and ſo form the body, as that it ſhall continue in full life, and with quick ſenſe, in union with the ſoul, in the hotteſt fire that can be imagined.'* If the Almighty can do this for one moment, or if he can cauſe death, armed with all his terrors, to prey upon the body, while it is one with the ſoul; if he could do this for a moment, he can do the ſame through endleſs ages.

Though the pain of their bodies will be great, beyond conception; yet, it appears that mental pain, will make the principal part of the puniſhment of the damned. What things are neceſſary to puniſh the mind, or what things will go to finiſh the miſery of hell, we ſhall now ſee. Firſt, ſeveral things will be mentioned, generally; and ſecondly, one thing in particular, which is *deſpair*; to this ſome attention will be beſtowed.

Firſt. As we have already ſeen, the woful ſituation of the damned, being plunged into the bottomleſs pit, glowing with devouring flames, eſpecially the pain and torture of their own bodies, will make them *know* the wrath and power of the Almighty. This will fill their minds with terror, utterly conſume them with terrors! 'A great part of the puniſhment of the wicked, [the damned,] will conſiſt in a ſenſe of the greatneſs, power and terrible majeſty of JEHOVAH, and his wrath, and diſpleaſure with them, manifeſted in their proper effects. This will fill their minds with excruciating pain, and horror inexpreſſible, while the tokens of all theſe are exhibited in the moſt dreadful manner to them, in their puniſhment.'† It ſeems neceſſary in this caſe, they ſhould know the arm of the LORD is ſtrong;

* Hopkins' Syſtem. p. 223. Vol. 2. † Ibid. p. 193.

ſtrong; that arm which has caſt them down, and holds them in deſtruction; without a poſſibility of their eſcaping. A ſenſe of this is ſuited to break their ſpirits, cruſh their pride, and *grind them to powder!*—The prophet Iſaiah ſays, 'LORD, when thy 'hand is lifted up, they *will not ſee*, but they *ſhall ſee*, and be 'aſhamed for their envy at the people; yea the fire of thine ene-'mies ſhall devour them.'

'But there are other circumſtances and things, which will be 'dreadful ingredients in the cup of their puniſhment. Their 'own diſpoſition and exerciſes of heart, their ſelfiſhneſs and 'pride, and enmity to God, which will rage to a dreadful de-'gree, will be a ſource of conſtant miſery. Theſe will render 'the ſhame and contempt, which they ſhall ſuffer, moſt keenly 'painful, and, in a ſenſe, intolerable. They will never be in 'any degree reconciled to the divine decrees and government, 'and their dependence on God, and being abſolutely in his hands; 'but all this will be moſt painful to them; they will be diſpoſed 'to juſtify themſelves: and find fault with the law of God, and 'his treatment of them. Their oppoſition to all this, will be ſo 'ſtrong and conſtant, and their enmity will rage, ſo that a con-'ſtant conviction in their judgment and conſcience, that God 'deals juſtly with them, may not take place; and they will 'ſometimes, if not continually, in the utmoſt rage, blaſpheme 'the God of heaven. It will be, beyond our preſent concep-'tion, painful and tormenting to them, to know that they have 'not a friend in the univerſe, and never will have one, who will 'ſhow them the leaſt kindneſs, or have any pity on them: That 'God is againſt them and will caſt evil upon them, and not ſpare; 'and all the inhabitants of heaven highly approve of his treatment 'of them, and praiſe him for his righteous judgments, in pun-'iſhing them as they ſee he does. The conviction they will have 'of the happineſs of the redeemed, ſome of whom they deſpiſed 'and hated, when in this world, will excite their envy and mal-'ice to a high degree; which are tormenting paſſions, in pro-'portion to the ſtrength of their exerciſe.'

'Their company will add to their miſery. They will not find 'a friend among them; but all will be full of hatred, rage, and 'malice. The ſight and preſence of the devil and his angels, 'who have had a great hand in their ruin, and who will contin-'ue their ill will, and torment them in all the ways their cunning 'and malice can invent, will be very dreadful. And whatever 'intercourſe they may have with thoſe of mankind, who are 'ſuffering with them, it will give them no relief, but add to their

'miſery.

' miſery. And thoſe who have had the greateſt connexion with ' each other in this life, will be moſt unhappy together; who ' have injured each other, or been the means of their eternal ru- ' in. And thoſe companions and ſuppoſed friends, who have ' tempted and ſeduced each other into the practice of vice, and ' way of ruin, will, by their mutual accuſations and curſes, be ' a vexation and torment to each other.'*

Secondly. One thing, which is *deſpair*, demands particular attention. And becauſe this completes the tremendous ſcene before us; this is death to the ſoul. We ſhall therefore,

1. Notice what is intended by this deſpair. Scripture explains it thus; 'The expectation of the wicked ſhall periſh. ' When ' a wicked man dieth, his expectation ſhall periſh: and the hope ' of unjuſt men periſheth.'† ' The hypocrite's hope ſhall periſh; ' whoſe hope ſhall be cut off, and whoſe truſt ſhall be a ſpider's ' web. The eyes of the wicked ſhall fail, and they ſhall not eſ- ' cape, and their hope ſhall be as the giving up of the ghoſt.'‡ Our Saviour compares the hypocrite's hope of ſalvation, and the fatal conſequences of this hope, ' unto a fooliſh man, which ' built his houſe upon the ſand:—and it fell: and great was the ' fall of it.§ And in John's Revelation they are compared to a mill- ſtone, ſunk into the midſt of the ſea.‖ Chriſt again, to a ſtone falling on a man, and grinding him to powder.¶ Theſe things make it manifeſt that the damned are totally cut off from all hope. They have

* Ibid. p. 255, 256.

* Dr. Chauncy and others with him urges 1. Cor. xv. 25, 26. 'For he (Chriſt) ' muſt reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The laſt enemy that ſhall be ' deſtroyed is death.'—Concluding from hence that the ſecond death, and miſery of every kind, will be aboliſhed, or come to an end. This death, ' that ſhall be de- ſtroyed,' he allows to be the firſt death, that of the body only. But becauſe the firſt death is an enemy, therefore the ſecond is, and therefore the ſecond death will be deſtroy- ed. This is the Doctor's argument; which is of no force at all. Neither can it be ſhown from ſcripture, that the ſecond death is an enemy either to Chriſt or the redeem- ed. Certainly that which *ſhows his wrath*, and *makes his power known*, is no enemy to Chriſt; as alſo, that which *makes known* the riches of divine glory on the veſſels of mercy, is no enemy to them. The ſecond death, it is granted, is an enemy to the damned. But becauſe it is an enemy to them, it will of courſe be deſtroyed, is the ſame as to take for granted that all men will be ſaved. The firſt death therefore is the enemy here ſpoken of. And becauſe while the bodies of the redeemed are held un- der its power, it prevents that additional happineſs they will receive after the reſurrec- tion; as alſo that additional glory then to be given to Chriſt. Hence the firſt death is an enemy: and the only enemy here ſpoken of, that is, to Chriſt and the redeemed; and of courſe will be deſtroyed.—But the reader is referred to *Dr. Edwards againſt Dr. Chauncey*, Chap. xv; where he will find this point fully diſcuſſed. Dr. Edwards alſo ſhows, in the ſame Chap. that 'all enemies being put under Chriſt's feet,' no more in- tends a voluntary ſubmiſſion of all his enemies, than that of the five kings of Canaan in- tends this kind of ſubmiſſion; when Joſhua and his captains put their feet upon their necks. Joſh. x. 24.

† Prov. 10. 28. and 11. 7. ‡ Job 8. 13., 14 and 11. 20.

§ Matt. 7. 26, 27. ‖ Ch. 18, 21. ¶ Matt. 21, 14.

have no poſſible expectation of enjoying future good. Their expectation of good hereafter is dead or periſhed. Their hope is as the giving up of the ghoſt: Their ſchemes, their devices, their hope, their expectation, their all, figuratively ſpeaking, is ground to powder. And, according to what we have ſeen of the ſtate of the damned, they are not only cut off from good, but they are delivered over to evil; they ſee nothing but evil before them. Which evil is one perpetual death. This is the deſpair that reigns in hell.

2. Inſtead of a lax ſenſe of the word, it is neceſſary to take this deſpair in the moſt ſtrict or literal ſenſe. *Infinite*, *eternal*, and other unlimited terms, as we have ſeen, are often uſed in a lax or limited ſenſe; contrary to their natural meaning. So *deſpair* is often uſed in a lax ſenſe; not wholly to exclude hope. But, in this caſe it muſt be taken in its moſt literal ſenſe. It cannot anſwer to the idea of death, or of the ſecond death, unleſs it is taken in this manner. The ſecond death, as has been ſhown, is the death of the ſoul as well as the body. And the wages of ſin is death, both to ſoul and body.—This cannot be denied. All who hold to future puniſhment, allow that the damned receive their full wages; and of courſe, that their ſouls with their bodies ſuffer the ſecond death. Therefore, the ſouls or ſpirits of the damned are in this ſenſe dead. They are dead as to hope of future good, and they can ſee nothing but evil before them. This is the meaning of deſpair, in the literal ſenſe of the word. Deſpair, ſtrictly ſpeaking, and nothing but evil to come, have one meaning. Indeed, that deſpair which is as the giving up of the ghoſt, is literally deſpair. That deſpair which is like being ground to powder, is the higheſt kind of deſpair. But nothing ſhort of this can be ſaid of the damned. Where there is hope there is life. The leaſt degree of hope keeps the ſoul from ſinking. In this caſe, the ſoul cannot be dead; neither can the hope be as the giving up of the ghoſt.

It is here remarkable, there is an infinite odds between life and death. The loweſt poſſible degree of the former, is right oppoſite to the latter. So the loweſt degree of hope, even a poſſibility of eſcaping evil and enjoying good, is oppoſed to abſolute deſpair, and infinitely diverſe from it. From which it follows, that if the damned could ſee even a poſſibility of being delivered from hell, and taken to heaven, it would make their caſe quite another thing from what it now is. It would ſo, provided they are in abſolute deſpair. For in this caſe a bare poſſibility of deliverance would give inſtant relief to their ſouls—

would give them hope or life. And life is as oppoſite to death as light is to darkneſs.

Hence it is plain that this deſpair is abſolute deſpair. The damned being dead as to all hope, their hope as the giving up of the ghoſt, or as death itſelf; thus ſhut out from good, and nothing but evil appearing before them, they muſt be in abſolute deſpair. And they are not dead, in the ſenſe of the ſecond death, unleſs they do ſtrictly deſpair. Any thing ſhort of this, or the leaſt degree of hope is life to the ſoul. Therefore, to deny poſitive deſpair to the damned, is to deny that they ſuffer the ſecond death. It is the ſame as to deny that they receive thoſe wages of ſin which is death, both of body and mind.

This again is evident from what we have ſeen of the complete miſery of the damned.—They are *utterly conſumed with terrors*; therefore have no hope left. And if they are *utterly conſumed* with terrors, they find themſelves ſwallowed up in that ocean of evil which has no bounds; or from which they can never eſcape.—*They reſt not day nor night*; they have not the leaſt reſpite or relief. But hope gives relief, certainly to the ſoul, and of courſe to the body. Even the hope of being turned into nothing, were there no other hope, would give relief, ſome *reſt*, to ſuch as are caſt into a lake of fire burning with brimſtone. *No reſt*, therefore, or complete torment implies deſpair, complete deſpair of eſcape from the evil. The ſtrongeſt of expreſſions, which is *death*, is alſo uſed to intend and illuſtrate the complete torment of the damned. Which gives deſpair in the higheſt ſenſe; that is, death itſelf to their ſouls.

It is a fact, known by experience, that hope is the ſupport and life of the ſoul, it is the 'anchor of the ſoul.' The moſt diſtant hope would keep the heart from breaking, or the ſoul from ſinking. Such a ſtate could not be called death, unleſs we would confound life and death together. The ſoul never dies while the moſt diſtant hope remains. It is therefore impoſſible to conſider the deſtruction of ſoul and body in hell, *the ſecond death*, in any other ſenſe than has been ſtated. This death and diſpair are both one. When hope is cut off, the ſoul dies, and not before. Where hope has utterly periſhed, the ſecond death has begun his reign. But to ſay he reigns where hope reigns or lives is abſurd. It is remarkable that the term, *ſecond death*, ſhould be uſed and applied to the ſtate of the damned. For, with its connection, it decidedly ſhows they are dead as to all hope, or they are in abſolute deſpair.

The

The above agrees with the ill deſert of ſinners, and their receiving according to their deſert. God himſelf would be in deſpair, could they have their wiſhes. For if his council were defeated in the leaſt degree, his whole plan might as well be ſubverted: and his happineſs of courſe utterly deſtroyed. As, therefore, ſinners deſerve to be treated as they would treat God, ſo they deſerve to be caſt down into utter darkneſs or deſpair. But the damned have their full deſert, and accordingly have for their portion blackneſs of darkneſs, where hope never comes! —We ſhall now,

3. Enquire what things are neceſſary to effect this deſpair. And, the damned muſt know that God has decreed to hold them forever in the agonies of death, and that this decree is unalterable. Poſitive knowledge of theſe things is neceſſary in this caſe; otherwiſe it is impoſſible their ſouls ſhould ſink into an hopeleſs ſtate.

It is known by experience that we never deſpair, ſtrictly ſpeaking, of attaining ſome deſired object, until we are made certain we cannot attain it. We may give over the purſuit of an object, when the chance is againſt us. So when the chance is favourable, to be effected however with care, diligence, or labor, we may relinquiſh the purſuit. But no ſuch caſe will illuſtrate deſpair. The fact is, we leave one object and go to another; according as our circumſtances, our fancy, zeal, or fortitude of mind may be. But we do not give over when our all is at ſtake, till we have certain knowledge it is in vain to purſue. In the ſolemn caſe of life and death, we never give over before we know it is too late. While there is one chance in a million, or the leaſt proſpect of ſaving life, we keep up exertions for that end. But when we know it is too late, or when death comes, we have done, our *hope is clear gone*. On the contrary, let the caſe be ever ſo gloomy, one chance in any given number, and in the ſame degree there is hope: in this inſtance hope is not cut off. The reaſon is, there is not decided knowledge as to the event. Thus experience ſhows that poſitive knowledge and deſpair are inſeparable.

Why, therefore, the damned muſt know God has decreed, unalterably, to hold them forever under the tortures of death, elſe their hope cannot be cut off, the reaſon is plain. None but God is able to hold them in this manner. It is his power and decree only that can fix them, and uphold them in unquenchable fire. Therefore, nothing but his power and his fixed decree can make this event certain to their minds. But this e-

vent

vent muſt be made certain to them, or they are not in deſpair. But the damned are in deſpair. They therefore know God has decreed to hold them forever in the ſame ſtate of torment, and that this decree will not be altered.

We can rationally conceive of nothing but poſitive knowledge, that God has thus decreed, which can entirely cut off hope. Belief, expectation, or doubtful fear, of evil to come, does not wholly exclude hope. Neither when we can ſee no way of eſcape from evil, is our hope clear gone. We muſt firſt be certain we are ſhut up, and can never get out, before hope dies. But nothing ſhort of the fixed decree of God can make the event certain. God only can ſhut up the priſon of hell, and hold its miſerable ſufferers there, keep them in being under their exquiſite pains and tortures. So they muſt be certain God has determined it, before they can be certain of the event, and before their hope is periſhed. In hell, hope has periſhed, hope never enters thoſe dreary abodes; they of courſe are certain the decree of heaven has gone out againſt them, and will not be recalled.

The above agrees with Matt. x. 28. 'Fear not them which 'kill the body, but are not able to kill the ſoul: but rather fear 'him which is able to deſtroy both ſoul and body in hell.' God here claims to himſelf the excluſive power of deſtroying the ſoul. The ſame immediate power that formed it, and no other, is able to deſtroy it. All the power of creatures, combined, cannot reach it, or deſtroy the hope of one ſoul. But the decree of God can reach it, and pierce it through with the arrow of death. Creatures can be the means of carrying this decree into effect; or, in ſome way inſtrumental of completing the miſery of hell. But the decree muſt firſt go forth, and the damned be made to know it; elſe all that creatures can do, will be nothing towards cutting off their hope. It is not ſo as to the bodies of men. Their bodies may be killed by the hands of their fellow men, without their knowing God has determined it. But when they have killed the body this is all they can do: it remains for God to paſs the deciſive ſentence, which alone can fix the ſoul in a hopeleſs ſtate.——It is poſſible ſome would now raiſe this,

Objection. It is not neceſſary there ſhould be a poſitive decree, and this made certain to the minds of the damned, ſo to make their caſe appear deſperate to them. God can, without ſuch decree, cut off their hope; by making of it appear as a reality.

ality to them, that they ſhall never be delivered from hell; when, at the ſame time, he determines to deliver and ſave them.—— Though this objection does not even look plauſible, much leſs rational, yet it may be beſt to reply, as follows.

Anſ. 1. The damned, as we have ſeen, are made *to know the power* of God, in ſuch ſort as to have the moſt clear, full, and certain knowledge of their own entire dependence on his power. They therefore are certain they ſhall ſuffer neither leſs nor more, than what God will caſt upon them, and what he has determined to caſt upon them. Which argues it to be impoſſible they ſhould be miſtaken by things not real, or by falſe appearances.

Anſ. 2. The damned are made to know the extent of the curſe of God's law; what ſin deſerves, and what puniſhment the law demands. This is plain from God's *ſhowing his wrath*, and making *his power known* upon them; alſo by his making the ſame known to them. Which muſt exclude all falſe appearances, make things real and certain. If ſin deſerves endleſs puniſhment, the damned know it. If ſin deſerve a temporary puniſhment only, they know it. If they are doomed to ſuffer their full deſert, or ſomething ſhort of this; they know it. They therefore cannot be in deſpair, unleſs endleſs puniſhment is the curſe of the law, and this curſe is executed.

Anſ. 3. The ſentence on the wicked at the great day, is, 'Depart from me, ye curſed, into everlaſting fire.' If this means ſtrictly *everlaſting*, they know it; or whatever this ſentence intends, they cannot but know. It is abſurd to ſuppoſe a judge ſhould pronounce on criminals, eſpecially that the judge of the world ſhould pronounce on all the guilty, and they not know what the ſentence contains. If therefore this dreadful ſentence cuts off the hope of all the wicked, as it certainly does, it is the truth and reality of the caſe which does it, inſtead of a mere fiction.

Anſ. 4. The objection ſuppoſes that God makes things appear realities, which are not ſo. And that he makes the damned feel as though they were to be tormented forever, when, at the ſame time, he determines to redeem and ſave them. Which argues that he is obliged to uſe deception, the moſt notorious deception and falſehood, to govern the world. This objection, therefore, as it gives ſuch a contemptable character of the one true God, cannot be admitted. But let us ſee again.

Anſ. 5. The deſperate caſe of thoſe in hell, and what makes their caſe deſperate, Chriſt has ſhown us, as in Luke xvi. 22—26. 'The rich man alſo died, and was buried; and in hell he lifted

'up

'up his eyes, being in torments, and ſeeth Abraham afar off, 'and Lazarus in his boſom. And he cried and ſaid, Father 'Abraham, have mercy on me, and ſend Lazarus that he may 'dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for 'I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham ſaid, Son, remem-'ber that thou in thy lifetime receivedſt thy good things, and 'likewiſe Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted, and 'thou art tormented. And beſide all this, between us and you 'there is a great gulf fixed: ſo that they which would paſs from 'hence to you cannot; neither can they paſs to us, that would 'come from thence.'——The anſwer Abraham gives, is, 'Son, 'remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedſt thy good things.' This is in anſwer to Dives's begging for a drop of water only, and being denied. Which plainly, and moſt ſtrikingly teaches that he had already received all his good things he ever was to receive; and therefore it was in vain to beg for more, even the leaſt thing. So the phraſe, *receivedſt thy good things*, was underſtood among the Jews; being a proverbial expreſſion to ſhow that he had received his *reward*, or his *all*. The ſame we find in Luke vi. 24. 'Woe unto you that are rich: for you 'have received your conſolations.' Chriſt here places their 'conſolations' in oppoſition to the endleſs reward of the righ-teous. And, by theſe well known maxims or proverbs, plainly teaches, as the righteous receive all their evil things in this world, and their good things, nothing but good things in the next; ſo the rich or wicked receive all their good things in this, and their evil, nothing but evil things in the coming world. That the Jews thus underſtood Chriſt, being long accuſtomed to ſuch proverbial ſayings, I appeal to every one acquainted with an-cient Jewiſh matters. On this ground, Dives is denied even a drop of water, to cool his ſcorching tongue. His own natural father, and his once dear connections, whom he now ſees in heav-en, can ſhow him not the leaſt compaſſion. The reaſon is, he has already received all the good he ever was to receive.—'And 'beſide all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed,' un-alterably fixed. So the original word is ſometimes underſtood; ſee in 2 Tim. ii. 19. And ſo it muſt be taken here, as is clear from the whole connection. This *great gulf fixed*, in the moſt awful man-ner repreſents the fixed decree of Heaven. This decree forever holds the damned in their abyſs of woe. They never can break their priſon, or paſs from thence to heaven. Neither can the inhabitants of heaven ever paſs over to them, to give them re-lief.

But

But the preſent deſign is to ſhow what it is that makes the damned utterly deſpair. 'In hell *he lifted up his eyes*, being in torments.' He is made to know the utmoſt of his caſe; how he is cut off from all good, and can find no reſpite from his torments. He is made to know that the fixed decree of God has ſhut him out of heaven, and confined him in hell. Now, that this decree is unalterable, and that the damned are made certain it is ſo, will hence be evident. This decree is undoubtedly the thing that ſeizes their ſouls with death and deſpair; of courſe it muſt be unalterable, it cannot be otherwiſe. Were it only a temporary decree, and a ſafe paſſage afterwards to be made from hell to heaven, it could not poſſibly make their hope as the giving up of the ghoſt. And that God makes them feel as though this decree were unalterable, when he has made no ſuch decree, cannot be admitted. That this decree, therefore, is unalterable, and that they know it is, is evident from its fatal effects: it carries death and deſpair with it into their ſouls.

This agrees with the account given of the laſt judgment. The great Judge pronounces the final ſentence in ſo many words; 'Depart from me, ye curſed, into everlaſting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.' Thus are they curſed, and made to know this curſe; the dreadful ſentence being directed immediately to them by the Almighty Judge, whoſe voice muſt pierce their hearts and make them know. With this curſe are they caſt down into the ſame lake of fire prepared for devils, which is the ſecond death. As this curſe and the ſecond death are both one, ſo it muſt be the curſe of God's law; the full wages of ſin, and anſwerable to the infinite evil and ill deſert of ſin. And muſt be the death of both ſoul and body. Now, it is abſurd to ſay the ſouls of the wicked, as well as their bodies, are curſed in this manner, and at the ſame time have hope remaining. Certainly that curſe which is the curſe of the law, which is death, the ſecond death, the full wages of ſin, and anſwerable to the unlimited evil of ſin, muſt entirely cut off hope. But it is their feeling the weight of this curſe, knowing the extent of it, that makes them ſink into an hopeleſs ſtate.

The above alſo agrees with what the LORD ſaid to Pharaoh and other noted ſinners. Exod. ix. 14. 'For I will at this time 'ſend all my plagues upon thine heart,—that thou mayeſt know 'that there is none like me in all the earth.' And Ezek. vii. 9. 'Mine eye ſhall not ſpare, neither will I have pity: I will re-'compenſe thee according to thy ways—; and ye ſhall know 'that I am the LORD that ſmiteth.' God makes the damned themſelves

themſelves know his power and wrath. They find themſelves in his hand as the clay is in the hand of the potter. His hand and power being laid upon them, which alone cauſes their inexpreſſible pains and tortures; ſo they know it is 'the LORD that 'ſmiteth.' And as their whole exiſtence is employed in ſuffering, deſignedly to make them know his power, ſo are they as certain of his power as they are of their own exiſtence. They are equally certain of his wrath. For, it is for this end they are made to know his power, that they might know his wrath, or infinite and unchangeable hatred to ſin. Accordingly, they are as certain they have one endleſs ſtate of woe before them, that the awful decree of Heaven will not be altered, as that they are now in hell. This is death, this is the curſe, this is deſpair. And nothing ſhort of this will ſtrictly bear the name.

It is generally thought their pains and torments increaſe upon them; grow more ſharp, deadly, and devouring, the longer they have been in hell. It is natural to conclude, as they continue to feel the weight of divine power, and that almighty arm which cruſhes them, ſo they grow more and more certain of this power. They therefore have increaſing knowledge of his wrath; more and more ſee his unchangable hatred to ſin. And ſink deeper and deeper in deſpair. This appears confirmed by the figurative name or deſcription the bible gives of hell; which is *the bottomleſs pit.* It is *bottomleſs* or unlimited more properly as it applies to duration. In this reſpect it naturally has its meaning. Whether the place of miſery be unlimited or not, as to extenſion or depth, this would make no difference to ſuch as were caſt into it for a limited time. Hence, this figure, *bottomleſs pit*, can naturally and forcibly apply only to duration. Giving an idea, moſt awful, of an eternity of woe! and ever ſinking deeper into anguiſh and horror!

Thus, my Friend, we are conſtrained to explain the ſecond death in ſuch manner as to eſtabliſh the doctrine of endleſs puniſhment. The ſecond death neceſſarily includes deſpair; it is impoſſible abſolute deſpair ſhould be left out of the account; this death cannot take place without it. And deſpair neceſſarily includes certain knowledge that the torments of hell never will come to an end. Without this certain knowledge it is impoſſible they ſhould ſink into an hopeleſs ſtate. Again, it is impoſſible they ſhould poſitively know their torments never will end, unleſs the unalterable decree of God has made them know it. Neither can we conceive of things in any other way, unleſs, we charge God with notorious deception and falſehood.—What remains is to *improve* this ſubject.

1. We

1. We are naturally led to contemplate, a moment, the ſcene before us. Inexpreſſibly dreadful is the ſtate of the damned. Caſt *alive*, body and ſoul, into a lake of devouring fire: Fire kindled by the wrath of the Almighty. Made to know his power, and to know his wrath. Made to know they ſuffer nothing more than they deſerve. Made to remember the *good things* they had in their lifetime. 'Son, remember that thou 'in thy lifetime receivedſt thy good things, and likewiſe Laza-'rus evil things! but now he is comforted, and thou art tor-'mented.'—Made to remember the kind offers of grace they once deſpiſed. God once called, and they refuſed. Now they call, and God refuſes; and all heaven refuſes.—Made to know God's holy indignation to ſin is unalterable. The dreadful ſentence, gone out againſt them, cannot be recalled: an eternity of exquiſite pain lying before them. O eternity, eternity! one eternity of woe! Death around them, death within them, death more painful ſtill to come, and without end. O death, death, death! one increaſing and eternal agony of death! We here ſee what is the *ſting of death*.

2. As great and tremendous as this puniſhment is, it is no more than anſwerable to the evil of ſin. The Judge of all the earth goes by this righteous law: Eye for eye, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, ſtripe for ſtripe. As ſinners would do to God, in like manner God deals with them.

3. Whatever Univerſaliſts may ſay againſt it, the divine character appears moſt amiable and glorious, when he executes this *death* on his implacable enemies. It is hence manifeſt, beyond all contradiction, that he *is a jealous God*; and that he regards the ſafety and happineſs of all his obedient ſubjects. In well regulated civil governments, the character of a chief ruler never appears more amiable and dignified, than when he adheres cloſely to the rules of juſtice; by inflicting exemplary puniſhment on criminals, as the occaſion requires. The ſafety and peace of the community is accordingly kept inviolable. A way is alſo made, when occaſion offers, for acts of clemency and pardon to appear to the beſt advantage. So God, when he taketh vengeance, when he inflicts death, the ſecond death; not only makes juſtice ſhine glorioufly, but makes mercy appear with equal luſtre and glory. Beſide, it is hence evident he aims at the greateſt good of the univerſe. The good ariſing from this moſt awful and terrible diſplay of divine majeſty, in the eternal miſery of the damned, overbalances the evil. The happineſs

occaſioned by this miſery ſo far outweighs it, as to make it better for the univerſe than if this miſery had never been. This infinite good is unfolded: It is now demonſtrated God has an unchangeable hatred to ſin, at the ſame time delights not in the death of the ſinner. He is juſt, he is merciful. He taketh vengeance, he is alſo ſlow to anger and full of compaſſion. A ſource here of inexhauſtible good. This again is clear from fact and experience among men. More good and happineſs ariſes to the public, by capital puniſhment on ſome part of a rebellious crew, than if the whole were pardoned: eſpecially in which caſe offered pardon is refuſed. How many of our race will be ſuffered to go the way down to eternal death, is left with divine wiſdom to decide. But the multitude, out of all nations, kindreds, and tongues, choſen and ordained to eternal life, is ſo great as no man can number.

4. On the univerſal plan, this ſource of inexhauſtible good is totally denied. God does not ſhow his wrath againſt ſin, according to what ſin is, or as though it were an infinite evil. On their plan, it is not divine wrath, or it is not the wrath of JEHOVAH. It is not the execution of the ſecond death, or the full wages of ſin; yea, a temporary puniſhment is quite another thing, falls infinitely ſhort of the ſecond death, or what ſin deſerves. So that the divine character, in their ſcheme, never appears in this particular view. His hatred to ſin, as ſin, and by inflicting death, of both ſoul and body on the ſinner, is forever kept out of ſight. And as he does not ſhow his wrath on the veſſels of wrath, ſo neither does he make known the riches of his glory on the veſſels of mercy. Where juſtice is kept out of view, or where it is not revealed equal to the evil of ſin, there is no ground for the glory of mercy to be revealed. Let us therefore, my dear Sir, beware of that ſcheme which is neither a ſcheme of benevolence, nor is it for the beſt good of the whole. Let us alſo beware of the ſcheme which directly denies that Pharaoh and his hoſt, and the Canaanites were given to be as meat or bread for Iſrael. Beware of that which denies that the enemies of the LORD are made as the fat of lambs on the altar, offered as a ſacrifice for the good of Zion. Beware of the ſcheme which denies that God taketh vengeance on anti-chriſtian apoſtates, and on all reprobate ſinners; ſo to enhance the everlaſting joy of heaven. See Rev. xviii. 20, and xix. 2.

5. This ſubject teaches the importance of Chriſt's miſſion into the world. 'The Son of Man is come to ſeek and to ſave

'that

'that which was loſt.'* As all men were under ſentence of death, the ſecond death, ſo they were utterly loſt. Which ſhows the impoſſibility of any part being ſaved, had not Chriſt come to ſeek and to ſave. Hence the importance of his coming, as well the greatneſs of the work he came to do.

6. As Chriſt died to open a door for all men to eſcape this death, and all do indeed eſcape it who believe in him; we of courſe ſee how meritorious is his death. His death ranſoms from infinite or everlaſting death; therefore, his death is infinitely meritorious. Whereas, on the univerſal plan, his death is no more than that of a mere creature. To die and offer up himſelf, a redemption from temporary death or puniſhment, is nothing more than a mere creature might do. In this way, the death of Chriſt is comparatively reduced to nothing. But our

ſubject

* Luke 19. 10. Univerſaliſts ſay, the *ſaved* here are the ſame as were *loſt*, and all that were *loſt*. Therefore, they ſay, as all were loſt ſo all will be ſaved. But we have only to ſet their own arguments againſt them. They deny the infinite evil of ſin. Dr. Huntington allows it, then again impliedly denies it. It is neceſſary, we have ſeen, that Univerſaliſts, all of them, ſhould deny the unlimited evil of ſin, either directly or indirectly. Thus, in their ſcheme, men do not deſerve endleſs puniſhment. Neither can they be juſtly ſentenced to this puniſhment. Neither can they, in juſtice, be made to feel as though they were ſentenced to it. That is, they never can ſink into an hopeleſs ſtate. It is impoſſible a juſt God ſhould make them ſuffer more than they deſerve. And to be made to feel as though their caſe were hopeleſs, when they do not deſerve endleſs puniſhment—to be made to ſuffer *deſpair*, death itſelf to their ſouls, when they deſerve to ſuffer only for a time, is a puniſhment infinitely greater than they deſerve. Which a juſt God cannot inflict. He will inflict no more than the curſe of the law. As the damned will be judged and condemned by the law, ſo they will be made to feel its full curſe, and no more. If they do not deſerve endleſs puniſhment they know it, and cannot but know it; therefore in this caſe, they cannot ſink without hope. Hence, it is clear that the ſouls of men, in their ſcheme, are not loſt, and never can be loſt. Where death and deſpair are denied, how are the ſouls of men loſt? And where the unlimited evil of ſin is denied, how can death and deſpair ever come?—On their plan, the damned cannot but have *a lively hope*, that their torments will in due time be at an end. And the more they are tormented, the ſooner this will fit them for heaven. —It will here be ſaid, there are ſome caſes of deſpair in this world, and they are afterwards delivered from it. Then why not the ſame in heli? Anſ. In a looſe ſenſe of the word, this may be called deſpair. But, without a miracle, it is evidently impoſſible ſoul and body ſhould be kept together a moment, in this preſent ſtate, under the deadly anguiſh of deſpair, or the ſtroke of death itſelf, as it reigns in hell.—Mr. Winchester treats of deſpair among the damned in a looſe ſenſe of the word. He ſays, 'It is evident they [the damned] are ſhut up in a ſtate of keen tormenting deſ-'pair, or dreadful ſuſpenſe, and may be fully perſuaded that they ſhall never be re-'leaſed, of which it is likely they may not have even the moſt diſtant hope.' Dialogues, p. 114. He does not here ſay they certainly *know* they ſhall never be releaſed; but they may be *fully perſuaded*, &c. and 'it is *likely* they may not have,' or. Again, 'They are ſhut up in a ſtate of *keen* tormenting *deſpair*, or dreadful *ſuſpenſe*.'—Between deſpair, ſtrictly ſpeaking, and ſuſpenſe, there is an infinite odds. The latter does not cut off hope; but generally means as great a chance one way as the other. Therefore, when Mr. W. takes *deſpair* and *ſuſpenſe* as being both one, he muſt mean deſpair in a looſe ſenſe. And all he has ſaid about the hypocrite's hope being cut off, and the hope of the wicked periſhing, &c. only amounts to this, the wicked are moſt agreeably and happily diſappointed.

ſubject exhibits his ſufferings and death in the moſt dignified and exalted point of view. It was the great God, a divine perſon, one equal with the Father, who died, and made his ſoul an offering for ſin. Becauſe, to redeem from the curſe, from death eternal, muſt require an offering moſt valuable, a ranſom infinitely precious.

7. As the redeemed in heaven will forever behold that awful ſight in hell, that exquiſite torture, horror, and deſpair; they will have the beſt opportunity to ſee what they themſelves deſerve, from what they were redeemed, and the preciouſneſs of that blood which redeemed them. They will forever have the beſt opportunity to ſing, with ſweet melodious joy, 'Worthy is 'the Lamb that was ſlain to receive power, and riches, and wiſ-'dom, and ſtrength, and honor, and glory, and bleſſing.'*

8. The inſtance before us makes it plain that the redeemed in heaven are completely holy. They look down and ſee their own deareſt kindred in hell, under all the bitter agonies of death, and they ſtand unmoved at the ſight; they maintain perfect calmneſs and undiſturbed joy. They hear the great Judge pronounce the final ſentence; they ſee all the wicked ſink down to hell, and hell moved with devouring flames to meet them; a ſight infinitely more dreadful than the ſinking of worlds. At the ſame time they begin the triumphant ſong. They ſee the power of God employed, in the moſt terrible manner, to make their deareſt and neareſt connections forever miſerable. And for this diſplay of his power, they aſcribe unto him, bleſſing, and glory, and wiſdom, and thankſgiving. This conſideration, were there no other, is proof that the redeemed in heaven ſtand complete in holineſs. They feel exactly as God does according to their meaſure; or they are *filled with all the fulneſs of God.*

This conſideration, my Friend, may alſo be improved for to ſearch and try our own hearts. The queſtion is, whether, under our preſent trials, eſpecially at the death of a dear relative, our conduct has any likeneſs to the example before us? Under theſe trials, do we manifeſt an heavenly temper? Do we ſhow ſubmiſſion to the holy will of God? Do we ſhow to the world, love, and joy in the diſplays of his power, his terrible majeſty, and glorious juſtice? If we do not love theſe perfections of Deity, manifeſted in their proper effects, how can we delight in the riches of his grace? An heavenly temper muſt begin in this world. When death comes it is forever too late. But, O the peace, the joy, and ſtrength the ſoul feels, that is entirely ſwallowed up in God!

9. The

* Rev. 5. 12.

9. The ſubject brings to view the pitiful ſtate of all ſuch as are going on in ſin, rejecting offered ſalvation.

Some are convicted of the truth and reality of endleſs puniſhment; and allow themſelves to be conſtantly expoſed to it, and that this muſt be their portion, ſhould they die in their preſent ſtate. But their ſtrong bias to ſinful pleaſures urges them on againſt the light of their own conſciences. They ſee nothing but death before them; they hear the kind Saviour inviting them to turn and live. 'Why will ye die?' but they will not turn at his reproofs. How pitiful, how deeply affecting is the caſe of ſuch as will venture on with their eyes open, going down to death, their ſteps taking hold on hell! When they are, ſome of them, powerfully awakened and convinced, they fly to their own works for refuge, but will not come to Chriſt for life.

But how pitiful, how ſhocking is the caſe of all openly vicious perſons! The profane, the falſe ſwearer, and bold blaſphemer; the contentious, the unjuſt, the unmerciful, the cruel, and the oppreſſor; the fornicator, and adulterer; the thief, drunkard, and all liars; theſe, except they repent, ſhall not inherit the kingdom of God. But muſt have their portion in the lake that burneth with fire and brimſtone, which is the ſecond death.

And what will become of all ſuch as caſt the Lord God behind their back! Who diſregard his ſabbaths, worſhip, and ordinances; who wholly neglect, or openly reject the ſacred ſcriptures; who caſt off fear, and reſtrain prayer? The LORD will come in a day when they look not for him, and in an hour when they are not aware, and will cut them in ſunder, and will appoint them their portion with the unbelievers; there ſhall be eternal weeping, wailing, and gnaſhing of teeth.

There are multitudes at the preſent day who not only profane the great name of JEHOVAH, but even ſport with that which is above all things dreadful; that is *eternal damnation*. Almoſt every breath they will call upon God to *damn their ſouls to hell;* or they will damn and curſe themſelves, or curſe their fellow men. Not thinking how they provoke the Almighty to ſtop their breath; to fix *the curſe* in their own ſouls, and conſign them down to endleſs woe and deſpair. O that theſe ſinners would awake, before it is too late; and tremble, and be aſtoniſhed at the patience of God towards them!

Others there are who build their hope on a refuge of lies, a ſcheme of contradiction; that is, a belief in the ſalvation of all men. This ſcheme is ſuited to gratify all the deceitful workings of ſin. However they live, whatever their hearts and lives

may

may be, they are aſſured it will be well with them in the end. 'The wicked hath ſaid in his heart, I ſhall not be moved; for 'I ſhall never be in adverſity.'* 'Leſt there ſhould be among 'you a root that beareth gall and wormwood; and it came to 'paſs, when he heareth *the words of this curſe*, that he bleſs 'himſelf in his heart, ſaying, I ſhall have *peace*, though I walk 'in the imagination of mine heart; to add drunkenneſs to thirſt.'† 'For when they ſhall ſay, *Peace and ſafety;* then ſudden deſ-'truction cometh upon them, and they ſhall not eſcape.'‡

What above all is to be lamented, ſome profeſſed miniſters of the goſpel are the avowed inſtruments of this deluſion. It is a ſerious queſtion whether the word of the LORD has not marked out theſe under the name of falſe prophets; as in theſe words: 'They have ſeduced my people, ſaying, *Peace*, and 'there was no peace.' 'They ſay unto every one that walketh 'after the imagination of his own heart, *No evil thing* ſhall come 'upon you.' 'With lies ye have ſtrengthened the hands of the 'wicked, that he ſhould not turn from his wicked way, by 'promiſing him life.'*

Surely, the caſe of ſuch, of whatever deſcription, as diſobey the goſpel, calls for the moſt tender compaſſion, and fervent prayer of every true friend of Zion. And they are to be rebuked, exhorted, and entreated, with all longſuffering and patience; if peradventure God would give them repentance.

Laſtly. Let us, my Friend, bring the matter home to ourſelves. And paſſing over all the contradictions and abſurdities in the univerſal ſcheme; paſſing over the plain declarations in the bible, of *everlaſting puniſhment*, and the original intent of theſe words; alſo the infinite evil of ſin, with the certain reward of the finally impenitent, and many other things; and confining ourſelves to the ſenſe of the ſecond death, is it poſſible to embrace the univerſal ſcheme? Is it poſſible to deny the doctrine of endleſs puniſhment, when this puniſhment is neceſſary to conſtitute the ſecond death? What then is our caſe, provided we have no hope in Chriſt? Do you live without hope, and without God in the world? Then let me beſeech you to awake. O ſir, awake, awake from your deadly ſleep! As you love your own ſoul, be entreated not to forget a moment your ſituation, ſo inconceivably critical and dangerous; having nothing to ſecure you from ſinking down into endleſs death and deſpair. By this, let me warn you to flee from the wrath to come. Remember that the Lord Jeſus now invites you to look unto

* Pſal. 10. 6. † Deut. 29. 18. ‡ 1 Theſſ. 5. 3.
* Jerem. 23. 17. and Ezek. 13. 10, 21.

unto him and be ſaved from this death ; and you are now commanded, as well as invited, to repent and believe on him for eternal life. Why will you not believe in the bleſſed Jeſus ?

But granting each of us to have an hope that it will be well with us after death. The ſcripture ſpeaks of both the true and falſe hope. Ours may be the hope of the pypocrite, and is as likely to be ſo as that of others. The dreadful end of the hypopocrite's hope we have ſeen. And above all others is his caſe wretched, when he lifts up his eyes in hell, being in torments. His total diſappointment, his hope of heaven cut off, and his truſt a ſpider's web, make one great part of his miſery ; and muſt ſink him lower in hell. And becauſe he would deceive himſelf, choſe to be blind, and go down to hell with a lie in his right hand, is his torment peculiarly aggravated, and forever increaſing upon him. O the diſappointment, the total diſappointment and overthrow of the hypocrite ! which falls upon him ſuddenly, as the lightening ſhineth from the eaſt to the weſt. 'How are they brought into deſolation, as in a moment ! They 'are utterly conſumed with terrors.' This thought may make us tremble. And may engage us to diligence, watchfulneſs, and prayer ; comparing our hearts and lives, at the ſame time, with the ſtandard of divine truth. Bleſſed are thoſe ſervants, whom the LORD when *he cometh ſhall find watching.*

I am, my dear Friend,

Reſpectfully and Affectionately Yours,

JOSIAH SPAULDING.

FINIS.